

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

APRIL, 1892.

ENGLAND'S DEVOTION TO ST. PETER
DURING A THOUSAND YEARS.*

3—THE ENGLISH SCHOOL IN ROME.

HOW thoroughly Roman was the Catholic Church in England from the earliest period is apparent from the foundation of the Angle-School, or the School of the Anglo-Saxons close to the Shrine of St. Peter, in the suburbs of Rome. Whether this celebrated school owes its origin to King Ine, or to King Offa, as Matthew Paris, Roger of Wendover, and others suppose, or conjointly, as seems more probable, and as Cardinal Garampi believes, to the Popes and to the English, is not absolutely certain. But this we know, that in the 8th century the inhabited part of Rome was at a considerable distance from the Vatican Hill and St. Peter's, and that, whereas other nationalities established themselves nearer to the Lateran, the Anglo-Saxons delighted to gather together as near as they could to the place sanctified by the Body of the Apostle. They sought to be near that Body which had drawn them so powerfully away from all the ties of home. On the vacant space, then, between the Mausoleum of Hadrian, now called the Castle of Sant' Angelo, the Tiber, and St. Peter's, there sprung up by degrees a mass of buildings, which was variously called the Saxon Borgo, the Saxon Street,

*Continued from the January Number, 1892.
[No. 2 of *Fourth Series.*] L

St. Peter's Borgo, and later on the Leonine City, in consequence of St. Leo IV. having re-built and surrounded the whole with a strong high wall, as a protection against the Saracens who had pillaged St. Peter's, and had even quartered their horses within the sacred Basilica.* Here our devout Anglo-Saxon pilgrim ancestors used to congregate in large numbers, and as many of them were ill-provided with worldly goods, they were constantly an object of charity, in their poverty and sufferings, to the Popes. Anastasius mentions that the Pontiffs were then living at the Lateran, and that among others Pope St. Zachary, in the middle of the eighth century, was in the habit of sending frequent supplies of food from the Lateran to the poor pilgrims who had congregated in the quarter near St. Peter's. In those days there were, of course, no inns and hotels as at present. But provision was made for pilgrims, for, besides the monastic institutions, the Deacons in different parts of the City used to look after the interest of Christian strangers, and to undertake all necessary works of charity for them. Among the latter were, of course, spiritual works of mercy. Each Deaconry, therefore, had a church of its own for the purpose. The only survival of this state of things now is the existence of the seven Cardinal Deacons of the Sacred College, and the work carried on by the Institute of the Santissima Trinità dei Pellegrini.

Here, then, near St. Peter's, flocked the Anglo-Saxon pilgrims for centuries, for purposes not only of devotion but also of learning. Here arose, on the site now occupied by the Hospital of S. Spirito, the *Schola Saxia*, *Schola Anglorum*, *Schola Saxonum*, as it was differently styled in the Papal Bulls. Matthew Paris, in his *Chronicles*, points out the distinct

*Anastasius Bibliothecarius speaks of the destruction by fire of "omnem Anglorum habitationem, quae lingua communi Burgus dicebatur." The "Vicus Saxonum" was the street running at present between the Church of S. Spirito and the Monte; and the gateway in the wall, built by Leo IV. about 850, near the English School, was called the "Posterula Saxonum." Later on writers, such as Geoffrey de Bruit, in his *Chronicles*, speak of this quarter as the *Burgus Sancti Petri*. The learned Cardinal Garampi maintains that the name *Burgus* or *Borgo* was derived from the pure Anglo-Saxon word *Burh*—that our pilgrim ancestors were so numerous and important as to have imposed this word of their own idiom upon the locality. But this can hardly be maintained in face of the fact put forward by more recent critics, viz., that the word is common to all the Romance languages and is identical with the Latin word *Burgus*, which St. Isidore of Seville about A.D. 600 defined as "*domorum congregatio, quae muro non clauditur.*"

object for which this school was established. He says, "The Anglo-Saxon school was founded in Rome, in order that the kings of England and their race, as well as English bishops, priests, and students, might resort thither to be instructed in the doctrines of the Catholic faith, lest anything faulty or contrary to the Catholic faith might grow up in the English Church, so that they might return to their own country, confirmed in a strong enduring faith." Roger of Wendover gives much the same account, with an additional reason for the foundation of the Angle-School in Rome, viz., that the Popes from the time of St. Augustine had discouraged the establishment of such schools in England, on account of the continual heresies which followed the advent of the English into Britain through the intermixture with, and the influence of, pagan customs. The foundation, therefore, of a school, seated in the very centre of faith and orthodoxy, became a matter of the highest importance for the Church in England, and its establishment was promoted alike by the Anglo-Saxon Kings and by the Roman Pontiffs.

In time the support of this school became a national affair. It was more than once made the occasion by the Kings for enforcing the payment of Peter-pence, a portion of which was devoted to its maintenance. The school, with the appointment of its Priests and Directors or Masters, was placed under the jurisdiction of the Vatican Basilica, the creation of the Archpriest or Rector alone being reserved to the Sovereign Pontiff.* Indeed all churches and buildings in the neighbourhood of the Vatican were subject to the jurisdiction and oversight of the Vatican Chapter. Thus the little church and cemetery, called the *Chiesa del Salvatore*, belonged to St. Peter's, and was founded by the Popes for the burial of all pilgrims to Rome dying in that neighbourhood. It possessed another right, under the jurisdiction of St. Peter's, that of providing lodging and a public market for the pilgrims within the Leonine City; and in return certain dues were paid to it by the pilgrims resident in the district, and the goods of those who died intestate or without children, which by the old Roman Civil Law were forfeited to the State, went to the Church of the

* See Garampi's *Documenti inediti*, and *Bullar. Vat.* t. 1, pp. 23, 25.

Saviour, and therefore indirectly to the Vatican Basilica. Besides the dues paid by the English School to the Vatican in return for pastoral care and material aid, when needed, the school was subject, like all other institutions, to the State taxes levied by the Popes as Sovereigns of Rome. From these Pope Marinus, A.D. 883, on the petition of King *Ælfred*, freed the English School; and we read that King Canute, on his visit to Rome A.D. 1027, obtained an entire exemption for the Angle-School from the payment of all State tribute and tax to Pope John XIX.

The school, in course of years, suffered many vicissitudes, not without the fault apparently of our own countrymen.

In A.D. 817 (Anastasius Bibliothecarius tells us), through the malice of the devil and the negligence of some of the English nation, the school of the English was consumed by fire. Whatever may have been the origin of the fire or the negligence of the English, the whole of their buildings were so utterly consumed that no portion of them remained. And, moreover, by the progress of the flames the gallery which from thence led to the church of St. Peter was destroyed. The Holy Pope Paschal perceiving this about the beginning of the night, out of reverence to St. Peter, and compassion for the English in their misfortune, ran barefoot without any delay to the place. And so great mercy did God show to him, that as soon as he arrived, the flames lost power to proceed beyond the place where he stood, but by his prayers and the assistance of the people present they were immediately quenched. And then to prevent the rekindling of the fire the Holy Pope would not move from the place where he stood during the whole night till morning had dawned.

In commiseration likewise of the poverty of the English, brought on them by the devil's fraud and their own sloth, he bestowed such liberal gifts on them in silver and gold, in clothes and food, that they scarcely felt their loss at all. And not content with this, he made provision of timber and rebuilt their habitation as it had been before. The gallery to St. Peter he also repaired, and made it finer and stronger than it had been before.*

Thirty years later, as under Pope Paschal, so now under Pope St. Leo IV., the English School, and with it nearly the whole of the buildings in that quarter, were again destroyed by fire. It was then that Pope Leo undertook the great work of rebuilding the district and surrounding it with a high wall. But eight years after the conflagration the

* See Anast. Bib. in Paschali; and Cressy's Church History, p. 691.
Edit. 1668.

English School and Hospital still lay buried in their ashes, when King *Æthelwulf* went to Rome as a pilgrim in great state, and spent a whole year in the Holy City. He rebuilt the English School and enlarged it, and gave to it a more imposing appearance than it had possessed before. It continued to be supported by money from England.*

During the whole of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries frequent and honourable mention was made of the English School. But after that down to the time of Innocent III. all is darkness and obscurity. The long dissension that arose between the Papacy and the Empire, and which brought so many temporal sufferings upon Rome, broke up the continuous line of pilgrims. The school collapsed. Then came the Crusades, which drew the devotion of pilgrims towards the holy places in Palestine. The Leonine City itself was sacked and burnt by Henry IV. in 1084, by Henry V. in 1110, and by Frederick I. in 1167, so that the Angle-School was completely ruined, nothing remaining but its site and the little church, which had always belonged to it, dedicated to Blessed Mary the Holy Mother of God, with a few chaplains who continued to serve it.†

Innocent III., towards the close of the 12th century, converted the site into the great *Hospitale Sanctæ Mariae in Saxia*, later on called *Sancti Spiritus in Saxia, prope Ecclesiam Sanctæ Mariae in Saxia*.‡

Finally, after the lapse of three centuries, the urgent need of an English School in Rome again arose, and Gregory XIII. and Cardinal Allen turning a modern English Hospice for

* We see from a letter of Pope Alexander II. to King William the Conqueror that part of Peter-pence used to be devoted to the English School. "Nam ut bene nosti, donec Angli fideles erant, piaæ devotionis respectu ad cognitionem religionis annualem pensionem apostolicæ sedi exhibebant. Ex qua pars Romano Pontifici, pars ecclesiae Sanctæ Mariae, quae vocatur schola Anglorum, in usum fratrum deferebatur."

† See the Bull of Innocent III., A.D. 1198.

‡ "Innocentius III. papa hoc anno constituit domum hospitalem in urbe Roma, quam Hospitale Sancti Spiritus appellari fecit, in loco ubi quondam peregrinantibus de Anglia domicilium erat ædificatum et Anglorum Schola dictum, eamque deditavit opibus et redditibus et, ne quid ei decesset, misit predicatoros cum literis suis tam per Angliam quam per alias terras, ut ex largitione divitium et donatione mediocrum magis ac magis ad omnem copiam abundaret."—(From the Annals of Waverley, A.D. 1213.)

pilgrims into a College, the work of the old Anglo-Saxon School was again taken up and renewed. The need of it had become as imperative, in consequence of the rise of heresy in England, as when the Angles were endangering the purity of the Roman Faith in England by their tendency to religious error. Forty students from the English College in Rome have laid down their lives for the Faith in England as Martyrs, and during the last three centuries a continuous stream of Confessors has flowed to England from Rome, "lest anything faulty or contrary to the Catholic Faith might grow up in the English Church." Thus it is true to say that the venerable English College in Rome to-day is heir to the spirit and intentions which established and animated the Anglo-Saxon School in the Borgo a thousand years ago. There can be no doubt whatever but that the love of Blessed Peter and of his Faith, and submission to his Jurisdiction, are wonderfully promoted by living within the shadow of his Shrine and by constant contact with his See. This has been the constant experience of Catholic England for now nigh twelve hundred years.

4.—PUBLIC LAW ON PETER-PENCE.

Nothing witnesses more strikingly to the national faith and to the ancient love and reverence of England for Blessed Peter than that institution of purely English origin, called at different times and places smoke-penny, hearth-penny, fire-penny, Rom-feoh, Romescot, and Peter-penny.*

Lingard attributes the origin of Peter-pence to the very same reasons as those which led to its revival thirty years ago, namely, religious love and loyalty springing forth to supply necessities of the See of Peter.

"Rome," he says, "was the chief object of Anglo-Saxon liberality. The imperial city was no longer the mistress of the world. More than once she had been sacked by the barbarians: the provinces from which she formerly drew her subsistence, had submitted to their arms; her walls were insulted by the frequent inroads of the Saracens; and the Popes, with the numerous people dependent on their paternal authority,

* The three first names indicate that the tax was laid on the house or family; the three last that it was a fee, tax, or pecuniary sum paid to Rome in honour of St. Peter.

were frequently reduced to the lowest distress. By the Saxon princes, the affection which St. Gregory the Great had testified for their fathers, was gratefully remembered. They esteemed it a disgrace that the head of their religion should suffer the inconveniences of want, and each succeeding king was careful, by valuable donations, to demonstrate his veneration for the successor of St. Peter, and to contribute a portion of his wealth to support the government of the universal church."*

As to the precise date of the institution of Peter-pence, it is impossible to speak with certainty. It is easier to point to its growth than to its birth. Historical criticism has thrown grave doubt upon, if it has not exploded, the belief which long prevailed, that it was established by King Ine of Wessex. Nothing is said of Peter-pence in Ine's laws, nor by Bede, who records his abdication and his pilgrimage to Rome. The learned Cardinal Garampi, who was Prefect of the Secret Archivium of the Vatican in the middle of last century, is of opinion that it may be traced to Offa, King of Mercia. This sovereign having miraculously discovered the body of St. Alban, Britain's proto-martyr, on the festival of St. Peter's Chains, built a splendid monastery on the old Watling Road, called it by the name of Alban, and obtained special privileges for it from Pope Adrian I. in 793. In gratitude to St. Peter and the Holy See, the King then imposed an annual tax upon every family in his kingdom, to be paid to Rome. Garampi sees collateral evidence in the facts narrated by the various historians of St. Alban's Abbey, namely, that this was the only abbey in England exempted from the payment of Peter-pence, and that the day fixed, from the earliest time throughout the kingdom, for its general payment was the feast of St. Peter's Chains—that is, the day on which the body of St. Alban was miraculously discovered. There is no doubt but that Offa gave money to the successor of St. Peter and to the Angle-School in Rome. He fixed the amount at 365 mancuses, one to represent each day of the year; and Polydore Virgil† speaks of this tribute in connection with the King's doubtful visit to Rome, after he had repented of his treacherous murder of St. Æthelberht, King of the East Angles, in 792, and his consequent seizure of the East

* Hist. of the Anglo-Saxon Church, vol. i., pp. 279-280.

+ *Anglic. Hist.* lib. iv., p. 74, ed. Basil, 1570.

Anglian kingdom. The institution of an annual payment to Rome by Offa is abundantly clear from the apostolic letter of St. Leo III. to Kenulf, Offa's second successor in the kingdom of Mercia. Writing in 798, the Holy Father speaks of Offa's devotion to St. Peter, and says, "Votum vovit eidem Dei apostolo beato Petro clavigero regni celorum, ut per unumquemque annum scilicet quantos dies annus habuerit, tantos mancusas eidem Dei apostolo Ecclesiae nimirum CCCLXV. pro alimonia pauperum et luminariorum concinnatione emittere quod et fecit*"

Others, however, believe that this tribute of Peter-pence to the Holy See took its permanent form in the time of Æthelwulf, King of the West Saxons, who, as has been already said, spent the year 855 as a pilgrim in Rome. Upon his return he laid his kingdom under a contribution of 300 mancuses† to be paid annually to the Holy See, one third for the Basilica of St. Peter, one third for that of St. Paul, and a third to be used at the Pope's discretion. Though it be impossible to say at what particular date this English devotion consolidated into an annual and legal charge upon the country, it may be considered as certain that this form of devotion was in some way practised by our ancestors at least as early as the time of St. Gregory II. (715-731), who was Pope when Ine visited Rome. Indeed, generosity of this kind had probably been practised in some informal or casual manner in the preceding century. At the time of the Henrician Schism both those who lamented the cessation of the payment to the Holy See, and those who rejoiced in the rejection of the authority of the Pope, speak of the institution of Peter-pence as having existed in England for the long period of 800 years.

The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which was first gathered into a connected narrative in the 9th century, probably in the reign of King Ælfred, bears ample testimony to the Anglo-Saxon habit of sending support to the Holy See, as may be seen by the several following entries.

* Haddan and Stubbs's *Councils*, vol. iii., p. 525.

†A mancus was equal to 30 silver pence of the period. A penny was equal to about 3s. of our present money in purchasing power, before the Norman Conquest; intrinsically it was then worth about 3d. of to-day.

" In the same year [883] Sighelm and *Æthelstan* conveyed to Rome the alms which the King [*Ælfred*] had vowed [to send] thither, and also to India to St. Thomas, and to St. Bartholomew, when they sat down against the army [*i.e.* the Danish host] at London; and there, God be thanked, their prayer was very successful, after that vow.

And in the same year [885] the good Pope Marinus died, who freed the Angle race's school, at the prayer of *Ælfred*, King of the West Saxons; and he sent him great gifts, and part of the wood on which Christ suffered.

And the same year [887] that the army [the Danish host] went forth up over the bridge at Paris the Ealdorman *Æthelhelm* conveyed the alms of the West Saxons and of King *Ælfred* to Rome.

Ann. 888. In this year the Ealdorman Becca conveyed the alms of the West Saxons and of King *Ælfred* to Rome.

Ann. 889. In this year there was no journey to Rome, except that King *Ælfred* sent two couriers with letters.

Ann. 890. In this year the Abbot Beornhelm conveyed the alms of the West Saxons and of King *Ælfred* to Rome.

By the commencement of the tenth century the obligation to pay Peter-pence had become part and parcel of the public law of England.

The following extracts from the ancient laws of this country will show—(1) Who were bound to pay the Peter-pence, (2) the amount to be levied, (3) the persons by whom, and the time at which, the Peter-pence were to be gathered, and (4) the penalties and fines for refusal of payment :—

If any one withhold tithes, let him pay *lah-slit* among the Danes, *wite* among the English. If any one withhold *Rom-feoh*,* let him pay *lah-slit* among the Danes, *wite* among the English.†

And let every hearth-penny be rendered by Peter-Massday,‡ and he who shall not have paid it by that term, let him take it to Rome, and in addition thereto 30 pence, and bring them a certificate thence, that he had there rendered so much; and when he comes home, pay to the king 120 shillings. And if again he will not pay it, let him take it again to Rome, and with another such *bot*; and when he comes home, pay to the king 200 shillings. And the third time, if he yet will not, let him forfeit all that he owns.§

* *Lah-slit* and *wite* mean severally breach of law and legal punishment.
Rom-feoh is Rome fee.

+ *Laws of Edward and Guthrum.* Thorpe, vol. i., p. 171.

‡ That is by the Feast of St. Peter's Chains, Aug. 1st.

§ *Laws of Eadgar.* Thorpe, vol. i., 265. The shilling was until Henry VIII.'s time a mere money of account. There was no silver coin struck in England of higher value than a penny, until King Edward III. began the issue of groats, to pass for fourpence. Before the Norman Conquest the English shilling was reckoned at 5d., or the 48th part of a pound; after the

And we enjoin, that the priests remind people of what they ought to do to God for dues, in tithes, and in other things: first, plough-alms, 15 days after Easter; and a tithe of young, by Pentecost; and of earth-fruits, by All Saints; and *Rom-feoh*, by Peter-Mass; and church-scot, by Martin-Mass.*

We will that every Rome-penny be paid by Peter-Mass to the episcopal seat; and we will that in every wapentake there be named two true thanes, and one Mass-priest, who shall collect it, and afterwards render it, so that they dare swear to it. If a king's thane, or any *land-rica*, withhold it, let him pay 10 half-marks; half to Christ, half to the king. If any *tunes-man* conceal or withhold any penny, let the *land-rica* pay the penny, and take an ox from the man: and if the *land-rica* neglect it, then let Christ and the king take a full *bot* of 12 ores. †

And let *Rom-feoh* be paid every year by Peter's Mass; and let him who will not pay it give in addition 30 pence, and to the King pay 120 shillings. †

The payment of Peter-pence was laid not upon a few, but upon all, as is clear from the laws of Eadmund and Eadward.

A tithe we enjoin to every Christian man by his Christendom, and church-scot, and *Rom-feoh*, and plough-alms. And if any one will not so do, let him be excommunicated. §

And *Rom-feoh* by Peter's Mass; and whoever withholds it over that day, let him pay the penalty to the bishop, and 30 pence thereto, and to the king 120 shillings. ||

Every man who shall have live chattels of his own worth 30 pence, in his house, in the law of the English shall give the penny of St. Peter; and in the law of the Danes, ¶ (if he have chattels worth) half a mark [*i.e.* 80

Conquest it was reckoned at 12d., or the 20th part of a pound, in imitation of the French *sol* of 12 deniers, which was itself a mere money of account until the reign of St. Louis. Thus 120 shillings would have meant 720 pence or £3—now equal intrinsically to about £9, and in purchasing power to about £270 of modern money—a tremendous penalty, of which it would be curious to learn if it were ever fully enforced.

* *Canons enacted under King Eadgar.* Thorpe, ii., 257.

+ *Laws of the Northumbrian Priests.* Thorpe, ii., 299.

A *land-rica* was a landlord; a *tunes-man* a tenant or farmer. *Bot* means reparation, amends—the word being still current among us in the form of *boot*. The *mark* was a money of account, worth 160 pence or two-thirds of a pound; in Edward III.'s reign a half mark appeared as an actual coin of gold, under the name of a *noble*. An *ore* was a money of account in the Denalagu, reckoned at 16 pence or one-tenth of a *mark*.

‡ *Laws of King Æthelred.* Thorpe, i., 343.

§ *Laws of King Eadmund.* Thorpe, i., 245.

|| *Laws of King Cnut.* Thorpe, i., 367.

¶ The Danes, who in the ninth and tenth centuries had settled, roughly speaking, in Northumbria, East Anglia, and North-east Mercia, had a different coinage to the English, and were governed by their own laws. Their part of England was called the Denalagu, that is, the Dane-law.

pence.] It is to be demanded on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul, and must not be kept back beyond the feast of St. Peter's Chains. If anyone withhold it, the claim shall be brought before the King's Judge, for that penny is the King's alms, and the King's Judge shall compel him to render the penny, and the forfeiture to the King and to the Bishop. And if anyone have several houses, he shall pay the penny for the house that he shall dwell in at the feast of SS. Peter and Paul.*

The payment of Peter-pence to the Holy See, as a tribute of Faith and Devotion, had taken such possession of England by the time of the Norman Conquest, that William the Conqueror, far from ignoring it as a tribute, to which he had not been accustomed in Normandy, recognised the existing laws on Peter-pence and enforced them by new enactments.

The free-man, who possesses field cattle of the value of 30 pence, shall give the penny of St. Peter. But the lord shall acquit his cottiers and herdsmen and servants for one penny. The burgher, if he have chattels of his own to the value of half a mark, shall give the penny of St. Peter. In the Dane law, the free-man who shall have field cattle to the value of half a mark shall give the penny of St. Peter, and by the lord's penny all who live on his demesne shall be acquitted. But he who shall withhold the penny of St. Peter shall be compelled to pay it by ecclesiastical censure, and in addition 30 pence as forfeit. And if the case be pleaded before the King's Judge, the King shall have 40 shillings as a forfeit and the Bishop 30 pence.†

Henry I. legislated in the same sense.

Rome fee ought to be rendered on the feast of St. Peter's Chains; he who shall withhold it shall pay that penny to the Bishop and shall add to it 30 pence more; and to the King, 50 shillings.‡

**Laws of King Edward the Confessor.* Thorpe, i., 446. It may be well to add for the sake of accuracy that, whereas the former extracts from the old English laws on Peter-pence belong strictly to the Kings to whom they are ascribed, the Latin compilation called the *Laws of Edward the Confessor* is not contemporary with that saintly King, but is simply a *digested custumal*. The laws of St. Edward were, as says Bishop Stubbs, "recorded by the wise men of the shires under William the Conqueror, and edited by Glanville in the next century, with the legal language adapted to the later period." And in like manner, the *Leges Henrici Primi*, which again enforced the payment of Peter-pence, were, to use again the words of Bishop Stubbs, "a collection of legal memoranda and records of custom," gathered together early in the reign of Henry II.

†William the Conqueror; Thorpe, i., p. 474. The 50 shillings here referred to were shillings of 12 pence, just the same penalty as the 120 shillings of 5 pence appointed by the laws of Eadgar, Æthelred II., and Cnut, as above.

‡ Henry I.; Thorpe, i., 520.

The Apostolic Letters of the Popes to the English Sovereigns, and to their Legates and Bishops, form a history of Peter-pence from the advent of the Normans down to the Anglican Schism. It is unnecessary for the present purpose to quote from them, but mention may be made of some of the Popes whose letters are actually before us, namely, Popes Alexander II., Urban II., Paschal II., Adrian IV., Alexander III., Innocent III., Honorius III., Innocent IV., Clement V., John XXII., Alexander VI., Clement VII., down to Paul IV.

It is not surprising that the history of a tax like Peter-pence should be chequered by many variations and vicissitudes during the long period which elapsed from the advent of the grasping Normans to the climax of greed and iniquity consummated under Henry VIII.

William the Conqueror excused himself to St. Gregory VII. for the negligence that had been shown in transmitting Peter-pence, on the ground that he had been nearly three years absent beyond seas. But, as he was then returning to England, he promised to have the amount due collected at once, and transmitted through the Papal Legate, Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury.

Henry II., when fighting with St. Thomas of Canterbury, sent tempting offers by his envoys to Pope Alexander III. He promised that, if the Pope would depose the Archbishop, he would largely increase the amount of Peter-pence.* He would do this by reforming an abuse that had crept in during the last hundred years, whereby certain persons had managed to get rid of their obligation to pay Peter-pence. In other words, the King offered as a bribe the restoration of Peter-pence to its ancient footing—a penny yearly from every house or hearth. Needless to say, the bribe was not taken.

It was during a period of great trial, both to the Church and to the State, that in 1366, the payment of Peter-pence was

* In secreto domini papae auribus immurmurabant de archiepiscopi depositione, temptantes eum maximis promissis; tandem etiam adjecto quod denarium annum beati Petri, qui nunc a solis ascriptis glebae, nec tamen ab omnibus, datur in Anglia, rex faceret et confirmaret in perpetuum, ab omni habitatore terrae, ab omni domo a qua fumus exit in urbibus, castris, burgis, et villis donari; cresceret quidem Romanae Ecclesiae redditus in Anglia annuus, prater quod modo est, ad mille libras argenti.—(From W. Fitz-stephen's *Vita S. Thomae*, l. 65. Printed in "Materials for the Hist. of St. Thomas," ed. J. C. Robertson, vol. iii., p. 74.)

suspended for a time by King Edward III. and his Parliament. This high-handed proceeding was provoked by a letter from Pope Urban V., wherein the Holy Father demanded payment of all the arrears of King John's annual pension or tribute of 1,000 marks, which had not been paid for the last thirty-three years. It is a curious fact that, together with this stoppage of the tribute and of the Peter-pence, began the decline of the splendid fortune of King Edward III.

The King commanded that Peter-pence should no more be gathered nor paid to Rome. Saint Peter's pence is the king's almes, and all that hadd thirty penywoorth of goods, of one manner cattell in their house of their owne proper, should give their penny at Lammas. It amounted in all through Englande to 300 markes of silver.*

There seem to have been many occasions on which selfish human nature asserted itself, and various people sought to escape from the payment of even so small a sum as the Peter-penny. As, for instance, when at one time in certain parts of England the people were satisfied with making a ceremonial offering of a Peter-penny on the Altar instead of sending it to Rome; Pope Alexander II. complained of this abuse and rectified it. Then, no doubt, excessive money exactions and especially the abuse, whereby at one period a large number of benefices were bestowed upon absentee aliens, created a reaction even against Peter-pence; as when the Commons of England in the first Parliament of Richard II., 1377, tried to obtain for themselves an exemption therefrom, petitioning as follows:—

Item supplient [les dites Cœs], q̄ y puisse estre declaree en cest present Parlement, si la charge de le Denier Seint Piere, appelle Rome-peny, sera leve des dites Cœs, et paie al Collectour ñre Seint Piere le Pape, ou noun. *Resp.* Soit fait come devant ad este usee.†

In fact, had not Peter-pence become part of the law of the land it would no doubt have shared the fate of many sacrifices which men undertake in a spirit of faith and piety, but from which they fall away when left to their own private devotion, and when faith and piety grow cold or lukewarm. We have seen King Canute writing from Rome to remind his English

* John Stow's Annals, in an. 1365.

† Rotuli Parliamentorum, vol. iii., p. 21.

subjects of "what they owe to St. Peter in Rome both from the towns and vills," and so in like manner after the Norman Conquest, both clergy and laity needed from time to time to be reminded of their duty and required the support of public law, which sustained the national conscience.

It would appear that under the earlier Plantagenets a custom grew up whereby the payments due to the Holy See were compounded for a fixed annual sum, amounting to £200 or 300 marks. Pietro Grifi, who had been a Papal Collector in England in 1509, in his MS. work *De Officio Collectoris Anglie*, quoted by Garampi, says that there were copies of a Bull by Gregory V., dated from Orvieto, giving a practical sanction to this arrangement. Others think that the Bull referred to was one issued by Gregory IX. in 1229. But however that may be, Innocent III., in a letter directed to his envoys in England, in 1214, denied that any such composition had ever been sanctioned by his predecessors, and he urged that a prescription of a hundred years could not be shewn in its favour. But he added that, if the English prelates desired to try the question by an appeal to canon law, they might appeal within a given time, and the case should be tried in his presence. It appears, however, that the point was not pressed further by the Holy See, and the custom that had grown up continued to prevail,—£200 being yearly paid to the Pope's Collector, whether the number of English Dioceses was 17 as in the twelfth century, or 22 as they came to be in the middle of the sixteenth century.

From the time of this composition the Dioceses of England were each rated at a fixed sum in Peter-pence, as may be seen from the Register of Cencio Savelli, Chamberlain of the Roman Church, who succeeded Innocent III. on the Papal Chair, under the title of Honorius III.

The following details may be of interest as showing the amount due from each diocese in the thirteenth century. They are taken *ex Regesto Cencii Camerarii**.

* See British Mus. MSS., Abate Marini's Transcripts from the Vatican Archives, vol. i., p. 181.

Peter-pence is collected in this manner in England, (*i.e.*, in the thirteenth century) :—

From the Diocese of £ s. d.	(equivalent in pur-	£ s. d.	(of our present
	chasing power to		money.
Canterbury... 6 18 0		207 0 0	
Rochester..... 5 12 0	" "	168 0 0	" "
London..... 16 10 0	" "	495 0 0	" "
Norwich..... 21 10 0	" "	645 0 0	" "
Ely 5 0 0	" "	150 0 0	" "
Lincoln..... 42 0 0	" "	1260 0 0	" "
Chichester.... 8 0 0	" "	240 0 0	" "
Winchester... 17 6 8	" "	520 0 0	" "
Exeter..... 9 5 0	" "	277 10 0	" "
Worcester.... 10 5 0	" "	307 10 0	" "
Hereford..... 6 0 0	" "	180 0 0	" "
Bath 11 5 0	" "	337 10 0	" "
Salisbury.... 18 0 0	" "	540 0 0	" "
Coventry..... 10 5 0	" "	307 10 0	" "
York 11 10 0	" "	345 0 0	" "

*Total.... £199 6 8

†Total..... £5,980 0 0

This calculation is at the rate of 1d. to 2s. 6d.; others might take a higher rate, and bring the sum total up to £7,000 or £8,000.

It would not be difficult to get at the assessment of the different archdeaconries and parishes from the Registers which are still preserved and from the valuable works of antiquaries. By way of illustration take the Archdeaconry of Richmond, Diocese of York.

* Peter-pence were never paid in the diocese of Carlisle, the territory forming that diocese not having become an integral part of England till after the Norman Conquest, neither was it paid in the Welsh dioceses, nor in the Cumbrian deanery of Coupland in York Diocese.

† The present purchasing value of ancient money is open to many considerations, and authorities are by no means in agreement. The antiquarian friend, to whom I am indebted for many researches, calculates that at the time of the Norman Conquest the penny would be in purchasing power worth about three shillings of 1892, and that therefore the nominal £200 paid (or due) yearly in Peter-pence to Pope Alexander II., or Pope St. Gregory VII., would be worth between £7,000 and £8,000 a year if paid to Pope Leo XIII. Accordingly the lesser sum of 2s. 6d. for the penny has been taken in estimating the value of the rating in Cencio's Register, as by the thirteenth century the penny had diminished in purchasing power, though the same amount of precious metal was still divided into the same amount of nominal money. The purchasing power of £200 after Henry VIII. had debased the coinage, may be put perhaps at between £3,000 and £4,000 of our present money. Had England continued to be Catholic and to levy a penny upon each inhabited house within the area over which Peter-pence was formerly collected, the actual amount of Peter-pence, putting aside its present purchasing power, would now sum up to an annual round figure of £16,000.

It was assessed at £47 17s. 7d., more than four times the actual amount paid to the Holy See in the name of the whole diocese, as may be seen by reference to Cencio's Register. This Archdeaconry was subdivided into eight Deaneries, one of which was the Deanery of Amounderness,* now belonging partly to Salford and partly to Liverpool Diocese. It was assessed at £6 a year for Peter-pence, apportioned parochially as follows:—

	s.	d.		£ s. d.
Ribchester 5	4	{ equivalent in purchasing power at present to ...	8 0 0
Chippinge 3	0	" "	4 10 0
Preston 18	4	" "	27 10 0
Lython 3	0	" "	4 10 0
Kyrkham 23	4	" "	35 0 0
St. Michael's (Wyre)	11	4	" "	17 0 0
Garstange 16	0	" "	24 0 0
Cokerham 4	4	" "	6 10 0
Lonecastre 23	4	" "	35 0 0
Pulton 12	0	" "	18 0 0
	£6	0 0	Total†	£180 0 0

As to the manner of collecting Peter-pence. In early times it was the Bishop of each diocese who was accountable for the collection, which he paid over to the Papal Collector. The Popes had been in the habit, certainly as early as the twelfth century, as Grifi informs us, of nominating their Legates or Nuncios as Apostolic Collectors or Receivers of Peter-pence and of other Papal dues. In course of time, as the archidiaconal jurisdiction grew up, after the Conquest, the Archdeacons became intermediaries between the parish incumbents and the Bishops.‡

“ All Archdeacons of Inglonde gatherede peterpens of every fyer house within every parish one penye, which were grauntide VIII. hundrethe yeres

* *Registrum Honoris de Richmond*, ed Gale, in Append. No. x. Lond. 1722.

† Here again the multiple of 30 has been taken. For the Peter-pence assessment of the various Norfolk parishes, see Blomefield's *Norfolk* *passim*. For that of the Leicestershire parishes, see Nichols's *Leicestershire*, vol. i., pp. lxiii et seqq.

‡ It appears that Archdeaconries were first instituted in the province of York in 1090. The growth of the archidiaconal power was of Norman origin, and was in great measure due to the employment of Bishops in matters appertaining to the Court and the State.

paste . . . now tharchedeacons after thes pens gatherede payde the same in parte or all to the collector of Rome, saving tharchedeacons of Lincolne and Sarum, thes payde the pens gatherede to the Bisshope, the Bisshope payde to the collector."*

It would appear that the Rector, or in impropriated rectories the Vicar, gathered the Rome-penny of his parishioners between† the feasts of SS. Peter and Paul and St. Peter's Chains. He passed it on to the Rural Dean, the Rural Dean to the Archdeacon, and the Archdeacon either to the Bishop, to be handed on to the Papal Collector, or he gave it direct to the Pope's Receiver.

Later on, the amount seems to have been gathered at the archdiaconal visitation by the Archdeacon's Official, his Registrar or Sumner, until finally Peter-pence probably lost much of its devotional character, came to be merely a traditional charge upon certain property, or to be paid as a customary sum by churchwardens out of the receipts of their parish, and was no doubt often mixed up with synodals, procurations, pensions, or some other archdiaconal requisition.

Had the ancient law, requiring that the Peter-pence from every house should be sent to Rome, continued in force, with the growth of population the tribute paid to the Holy See would have become a very heavy sum indeed. Innocent III. in the thirteenth century, declared that the surplus retained in England was known to be three times the amount of the sum that was forwarded to Rome. But, as has been said, the amount paid over to the Papal Collector became a fixed quota for each Diocese. The excess over the sum fixed for particular parishes was often applied towards the endowment of

* *Instrucciones for my Lord Privey Seall concerning the Bisshope of Lincolne and his Archdeacon.* Mus. Brit. MSS., Cotton, Cleopatra F.I., ff. 84-85. The arrangement here spoken of was assuredly of modern growth, for formerly it was everywhere the Bishop who "paid to the Collector" and got his receipt for the payment. In the small diocese of Canterbury the Deans, not the Archdeacon, gathered the Peter-pence.

† It was to honour this immemorial custom that a law was made and promulgated by the Bishop of Salford in 1879, ordering the Peter-pence collection to be taken up, at the church doors or in any other way more convenient to the clergy, on the Sundays intervening between the feast of SS. Peter and Paul and the feast of St. Peter's Chains throughout the diocese. A standing diocesan notice to this effect appears in the *Ordo*.

vicarages,* while the excess over the sum fixed for a particular archdeaconry became the handsome perquisite of the Archdeacon. Sometimes the surplus of Peter-pence became part of the emolument of certain great monasteries, whose Archdeacon, a monk, had the collecting of them upon the abbatial lands exempt by privilege from episcopal jurisdiction; often portions of Rome-seot went to compensate persons who had a share in the work of collecting it, but it was especially the Archdeacons who reckoned the surplus as among their customary profits.

All this was clearly an abuse, and various Popes published Bulls or Letters for the purpose of protecting the people against the exactions practised by some of the Archdeacons on the plea of gathering Peter-pence. But, with whatever drawbacks and abuses, Peter-pence continued not only to be paid till the Schism, but often to be paid by the people with a strong sense of faith and devotion. The people always regarded the successor St. Peter not only as the Head of their Church, but as their Father and their last refuge against tyranny and injustice. Thus Pope Paul IV., in an Allocution delivered in Public Consistory to the English Ambassadors of Philip and Mary, A.D. 1555, urged a return to the devotion of Peter-pence,

* "Habebit Vicarius totam etiam decimam pannagii Domini Archiepiscopi, et molendinorum, et *residuum denarii Sancti Petri*." &c. Extract from the Ordination of the Vicarage of Harrow-on-the-Hill, in the County of Middlesex, made by St. Edmund Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1234 to 1240.—(N.B. Harrow-on-the-Hill, though locally in the diocese of London, was a peculiar of the Archbishop of Canterbury—the rectory became a sinecure).

"Percipiet Vicarius et decimam lane, agnorum, feni, lini et canabis totius parochie, una cum minutis decimis omnibus et singulis ad altaragium qualitercumque spectantibus, et *denarios Sancti Petri*. . . . Solvet et synodalia et procurationes archidiaconi consueta, et *denarios Sancti Petri*, &c." Extract from the Ordination of the Vicarage of Leyland, in the County of Lancaster, made in 1331 by Roger Northburgh, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield. (N.B. The rectory was inappropriate to the Priory or Cell of Penwortham. See "Penwortham Papers," Chetham Society.)

In 1349 a Vicarage was ordained by William de la Zouch, Archbishop of York, on the Rectory of Dewsby being appropriated in 1348 to the College of the Chapel Royal of St. Stephen at Westminster. Among the Vicar's profits were to be "*all the Peter-pence and the pennies for the consecrated bread [the holy bread], wont to be paid by the parishioners;*" and that by this "all" was meant the *residue* of the parochial Peter-pence is put beyond reasonable doubt by the fact that among the Vicar's *burthens* were to be procurations, synodals, *Peter-pence, &c.*" (See Ecclesiastical History of Dewsby, in Collectanea Topographica et Genelogica, vol. i., pp. 149-168).

Many other instances might easily be cited as Lancaster, Garstang, Wakefield, Buckingham, Bakewell, Tideswell, Kemsey, Blockley, &c.

saying that "he had himself been for three years Papal Collector of Peter-pence in England and that he *had been much edified* by observing the forwardness of the people to contribute, especially among the poorer and working classes."*

Peter-pence continued to be paid by England as a national homage to the Holy See until the passing of the Statute 25 Henry VIII., cap. 21, when it was enacted that no imposition or exaction should be any more paid to the Bishop of Rome by the subjects of the English Crown.

This statute was repealed by 1 & 2 Philip and Mary, cap. 8, which abrogated all statutes and provisions made against the Apostolic See since the 20th year of Henry VIII.

By Statute 1 Eliz., cap. 1, the Peter-pence law was again repealed; and thus, after seven or eight hundred years, this English tribute of affection and duty, variously known as Romescot, Peter-penny, Rome-penny, or Hearth-penny, came to an end in England, as an offering required by the law of the land to be made annually to the Father of Christendom.†

From what has been said, it is evident that an appeal may fairly be made to Peter-pence as an indubitable witness to the faith and devotion of the English Church and people to St. Peter and the Centre of Unity during the long centuries which preceded the Henrician Schism. That it was paid as an act of devotion by the English people is clear from the Charter of King Edward the Confessor, preserved at Westminster: "It has pleased me to renew, improve, and confirm the customs—gifts of money, which my predecessors, the kings, have ordained for St. Peter, *on account of the supreme devotion which the English people have ever shewn to him and his Vicars.*" That it was paid as an act of homage to the Head of the Church is shewn even by the *Valor Ecclesiasticus*

* Sarpi's *Istoria del Conc.* Trid. I.v., c. 15. Cf. Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. II. b. II. p. 311.

† That Peter-pence were collected long after the Reformation is quite certain, as "Notes and Queries" (July 26th, 1879) shew. "The query by C. T. B. respecting Peter-pence reminds me that in the 'Parish expenditure of Milton Abbot' the heywarden's 'accownte' for 1588 contains the item, 'For Peter's farthynges, vjd.' " The "old Churchwarden's Accounts of Tallaton, Devon," contained the entry "1610. Paid for Peter's farthings, xd." And Mr. Edward Peacock informs us (*ibidem*) that Peter's farthings are mentioned in the parish documents of Hartland, Devon, as late as the year 1613.

of Henry VIII., where, under the Archdeaconry of Essex, is the following entry : " Ultra xj^a annuatim solutos Regie Maiestati uti Supremo Cupiti Ecclesie Anglicane et Hib^{ce} pro denariis quondam vocatis peterpens."

Surely no unprejudiced mind will gainsay the fact that the imposition of Peter-pence upon England by English public law, and its payment during so many centuries by the nation, was a very practical and national recognition of the office of the Pope, and of national submission to his divine Authority. What English Parliament ever imposed taxes on the people, unless urged thereunto by an adequate sense of duty or necessity ? Can it be believed that the English people have been of so submissive and spiritless a character as to pay a money tribute, generation after generation, for 800 years, to one who had no good and substantial claim upon their Loyalty and Homage, to one whom they did not recognise as their divinely appointed Superior and Shepherd ? It had been simply impossible to have levied in England for centuries the national tax of Peter-pence, but in obedience to a national sense of loyalty and duty to the See of Peter.

Finally, to connect ancient with modern times, to note the continuity of the same doctrine and the same spirit—look for a moment at the recent revival of Peter-pence in England, and throughout the Church. Within six weeks of the occupation of the Romagna by the Piedmontese a cry for Peter-pence arose among the Catholics of England. The land that had originated this homage of faith, that had formerly interwoven it with its laws, and carried it on as a portion of its national life for centuries, till schism and heresy abolished it in a sea of blood, had now the privilege of being the first country in Christendom to call for its revival. The cry for Peter-pence arose once more in England, three centuries to the year, after its suppression by Elizabeth.

" Let the Peter-penny be re-introduced," were the words of the appeal published in November, 1859, by the *Tablet* newspaper, " not as a monetary help merely, but as a regular and lasting contribution. There are about eight millions of Catholics in England, Ireland, and Scotland. Supposing that everyone on an average pays one penny a year it will give

the round sum of £33,000. . . . We cannot doubt for a moment that this glorious and practical example will be followed by every part of the world."

The instinct was unmerring; the prediction was exact. Collections for the Pope were made throughout England, Ireland and Scotland. The Diocese of Dublin alone contributed over £16,000, the largest collection, it was said, ever made in the churches of that city of generous hearts. The example of England and Ireland was followed elsewhere. In 1860, at the instance of Cardinal Wiseman, a Commission was formed in furtherance of the work of Peter-pence, to be taken up by Christendom. Cardinal Wiseman also suggested a Confraternity of St. Peter. The idea was accepted. Peter-pence was to take the form of a devotion rather than of a tax. Its first object must ever be to strengthen Faith and Loyalty, and to draw Christendom more closely round the Vicar of Christ and the Chair of Truth, while its second object, also an essential one, must be to pay the Peter-penny.

Pius IX. indulged directly the prayers of the Confraternity, but only indirectly the payment of the Peter-penny. He attached an Indulgence to every good work done by members in furtherance of the Confraternity.

Hence it is true that the Catholics of England of to-day have once more shewn themselves heirs to the spirit and practice of their ancestors during the thousand years which preceded the schism of the sixteenth century. The continuity is perfect, because the Faith is identical. Peter still reigns in the heart of Catholic England. God grant that men may learn that there is no Catholicism where Peter is not.

THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

AGREAT change has, within recent years, taken place in the attitude of the Anglican Church in regard to the question of the dates, authorship, and authenticity of the books of the Old Testament. Only a few years ago, when Bishop Colenso published to the world his startling views as to the comparatively recent date of the Pentateuch, and the historical untrustworthiness of the narrative, the Church of England rose in arms against him: he was put upon his trial, and found guilty. Now, a large number of the most distinguished men of the established Church openly hold and defend the same opinions; nay, more—Dr. Gore, the head of Pusey House, at Oxford, has edited a work, and himself contributed to it an article, in which he practically adopts the results of modern criticism in regard to the Old Testament.

It is true that apparently a kind of reaction is setting in among the clergy of the Established Church against the destructive criticism that finds favour with so many of its members. A “declaration on the truth of Holy Scripture,” signed by thirty-eight Anglican clergymen of position, has been published within the last few weeks, and has caused much excitement, and led to a lengthy correspondence in the *Times*. But the results are not likely to be lasting. The thing has fallen flat. It wears the air of an “unauthorized programme,” and we notice that the names of their Right Rev. Lordships, the *Bishops* of the *Hierarchy* are conspicuous by their absence. The fact is the republican spirit is too deeply set in the Church of England for Bishops or other dignitaries to hope to curb the license with which articles of faith, or the Sacred Scriptures, are assailed by any, either clergy or laity, who are disposed to find fault with any thing contained in either.

Dr. Driver, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford University, is one of those who have taken up entirely with the new views. He has already passed through the press much in

which he supports the conclusions of modern criticism as to the Sacred Scriptures; but with his previous writings we are not at present concerned. The remarks we propose to offer in the present paper concern his most recent work,—a volume contributed to the National Theological Library, and entitled “An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament,”* which is, as the name indicates, a discussion of the character and authorship of the various books of the Old Testament. A large part of the volume is taken up with the consideration of the structure and composition of the Hexateuch—that is to say, the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. Our remarks shall be confined exclusively to that part of the work.

It will be necessary in the first place to set down, as succinctly as possible, what Dr. Driver's view is as to the composition of the Pentateuch. We confine ourselves to the Pentateuch, though Dr. Driver does not distinguish between the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, regarding the two together as forming one homogeneous whole. For we can, without inconvenience, discuss his views in regard to the Pentateuch alone, and then, before concluding, we shall explain why we do not regard the Book of Joshua as being essentially connected with it, though, no doubt, forming a kind of supplement to it.

Taking then the Pentateuch as it stands, Dr. Driver is of opinion that it is, broadly speaking, made up of three distinct documents or works, welded together so as to form one whole. The first of these:—

Has received different names, suggested by one or other of the various characteristics attaching to it. From its preference (till Exodus vi., 3,) for the name of *God* (“*Elohim*”) rather than *Jehovah* it has been termed the *Elohist* narrative, and its author has been called the *Elohist*; and these names are still sometimes employed. By Ewald it was termed the “Book of Origins;” by Tuch and Nöldeke, from the fact that it seemed to form the groundwork of our Hexateuch, the “Grundschrift;” more recently by Wellhausen, Küenen, and Delitzsch, it has been styled the “Priests' Code” (p. 8).

Dr. Driver himself adopts the term “Priests' Code” to specify this part of the Pentateuch, and for brevity sake,

* T. & T. Clarke, Edinburgh.

generally refers to it simply by the letter P. Going on further to consider what portion of the Pentateuch is included in this so-called Priests' Code, we find that it is declared to embrace a very large part of it. In fact, without going into detail, beginning with the sublime account of the Creation contained in the first chapter of Genesis, it presents "an outline of the antecedents and patriarchal history of Israel, in which only important occurrences—as the Creation, the Deluge, the covenants with Noah and Abraham—are described with minuteness" (p. 10). The same narrative we are told is found to run through the Book of Exodus, including the whole of Chapters XXV. to XXXI., which record the instructions given to Moses respecting the Tabernacle and the priesthood, and also Chapters XXXV. to XL., which narrate the execution by him of the orders he had received. The book of Leviticus may, roughly speaking, be attributed in its entirety to the same writer, though certain differences, in style and phraseology, are said to be detected in Chapters XVII. to XXVI. Finally the so-called Priests' Code makes up about three-fourths of the Book of Numbers.

As to the style of this portion of the Pentateuch, Dr. Driver says:—"If the parts assigned to P. be read attentively, even in a translation, and compared with the rest of the narrative, the peculiarities of its style will be apparent. Its language is that of a jurist, rather than a historian; it is circumstantial, formal, precise: a subject is developed systematically; and completeness of detail, even at the cost of some repetition, is regularly observed. Sentences are cast with great frequency into the same mould; and particular formulae are constantly repeated, especially such as articulate the progress of the narrative" (p. 10).

Such, according to Dr. Driver, is the Priests' Code, and such its style, distinct from that of any other part of the Pentateuch. As to when it was written, we are informed that it is the latest portion of the Hexateuch; in fact, that, in its completed form, it "is the work of the age subsequent to Ezechiel" (p. 135).

Besides the document of which we have been speaking, there is a second,—said to have been originally composed of two distinct narratives—which runs through the books of

Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, parallel to the so-called Priestly-Code. "One of these sources," says Dr. Driver (page 12) "from its use of the name *Jahweh*, is now generally denoted by the letter J; the other, in which the name *Elohim* is preferred, is denoted similarly by E; and the work formed by the combination of the two is referred to by the double letters JE." This double narrative, speaking generally, comprises all that remains of the first four books of the Pentateuch, after the so-called Priests' Code has been removed. As for distinguishing one part of this double narrative (JE.) from another, that can only be done roughly, as Dr. Driver very freely admits, "owing to the details being indecisive, and capable, consequently, of divergent interpretations;" (p. 12), not so however, in regard to P. and JE., which "form two clearly definable, independent sources." (p. 17).

As to the date of the double narrative called JE., apparently there is much difference of opinion among scholars of the critical school. Dillman, Kittel, and Riehm, assign E. priority to J., placing E. in the early part of the *ninth* century B.C.; whilst, on the other hand, Wellhausen, Küenen, and Stade, consider J. to be *earlier* than E., fixing it in the latter half of the *eighth* century B.C. All critics appear to be agreed that both J. and E. are anterior to the year 750, B.C. So the *terminus ad quem* is fixed: but, as we should expect, critical scholarship finds it more difficult to assign a date earlier than which JE. cannot have been written. "In fact, conclusive criteria fail us," says Dr. Driver. "We can only argue upon grounds of probability derived from our view of the progress of the art of writing, or of literary composition, &c." (p. 117). In fact, Dr. Driver, comparing JE. with the book of Judges, which he considers cannot be much later than David's time, will not undertake to say that it is not even earlier than that book.

We have now set forth Dr. Driver's view as to the composition of the first four books of the Pentateuch. "The book of Deuteronomy," says Dr. Driver (p. 67) "is relatively simple. The body of the book is pervaded throughout by a single purpose, and bears the marks of being the work of a single writer, who has taken as the basis of his discourses, partly the narrative and laws of JE., as they exist in the previous books

of the Pentateuch, partly laws derived from other sources" (p. 67). There are also traces of the so-called Priests' Code, we are told, towards the end of the book, but with that part of the Pentateuch generally, "it shows no phraseological connection whatever" (p. 95). "The literary style of Deuteronomy is very marked and individual. In vocabulary, indeed, it presents comparatively few exceptional words ; but particular words and phrases, consisting sometimes of entire clauses recur with extraordinary frequency, giving a distinctive colouring to every part of the work" (p. 91). Again of the writer :—" His power as an orator is shown in the long and stately periods with which his work abounds ; at the same time the parenetic treatment which his subject often demands, always maintains its freshness, and is never monotonous or prolix" (p. 95). As to the date of Deuteronomy, we are told it must have been written earlier than the 18th year of King Josias (B.C. 621), when Helcias discovered "the book of the law" in the temple. Dr. Driver finds it difficult to decide upon the exact date, but finally comes to the conclusion that it probably belongs to the reign of king Manasseh (x641, B.C.)

Such, in brief, according to the teaching of modern criticism, is the composition of the Pentateuch. It is made up of a composite narrative (JE.), which had its origin perhaps in the days of King David; of the Book of Deuteronomy, written about the time of King Manasseh; and finally of what is called the Priests' Code, which belongs to the time after the prophet Ezechiel (after the year 570, B.C.)

It is unnecessary for us to assert, on the other hand, that we regard Moses as the author of the Pentateuch; and accordingly that we have no sympathy whatever with Dr. Driver's views as to the dates of the different parts into which he divides that great work. On the other hand there are some of his conclusions which are not necessarily inconsistent with the Mosaic authorship, and, which at the same time are often adduced as proofs that the Pentateuch is not the work of the Great Hebrew Legislator : into the bearing which those conclusions have upon the question of the Mosaic authorship we propose to enter in the following pages.

When we speak of Moses as the author of the Pentateuch, we by no means necessarily assert, that he made use of no

previously existing documents in the composition of his work. That such a method of composition is not inconsistent with inspiration is clear; for it is the ordinary system upon which the historical books of the Old Testament have been written. Thus to omit the book of Joshua, to which it might be objected that it is in much the same position as the Pentateuch, it is universally admitted that the writer of Judges had at hand certain written sources, which he used in the composition of his work. Indeed, Cornely says* of it that "the style varies not a little in the different sections; nor can so great a difference be satisfactorily explained, unless the author be said to have faithfully transcribed what he found in the sources he drew from." That the narratives of the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles are largely drawn from written sources is obvious, if for no other reason, because a large number of written documents used by the writers, are referred to in the text; amongst others, the Book of the Just (II. Sam., i., 18), the Book of the Kings of Juda and Israel (II. Chron., xvi., 11), the Book of the words of the days of Solomon (II. Kings, xi., 41), the Book of Semeias the prophet, and of Addo the seer (II. Chron., xii., 15), the Book of the words of the days of the Kings of Juda (I. Kings, xv., 31), and many others too numerous to mention. Nor are we without proof of the closeness with which the authors of these books followed the sources which they had at hand; for comparing parallel passages from the Books of Kings and Chronicles, we find they are almost, and in many case absolutely, word for word alike.† Of the two books of Esdras Cornely says‡ that "no one, who has even cursorily read the two books, that we call the 1st and 2nd of Esdras, can escape the conclusion that various writings are therein joined and so to say glued together." Finally to take the books of the Maccabees, we read (2 Machabees cii., 24), that the inspired writer has composed it, by simply abridging into one work the five volumes of Jason of Cyrene; and in regard to the first book we know from two verses therein (ix., 22; xvi., 24) that the author made use of written sources; and we find that he has

* Introduction to Sacred Scripture, vol. I, p. 222.

† E.G. Cf. II. Kings, x., 1-29. II. Chron., ix., 1-28.

‡ Introduction. Vol. I., p. 359.

incorporated in his work, nine public documents, taken from the public archives.

There is no reason for astonishment, therefore, if we find that Moses, in the composition of the Pentateuch, incorporated in it previously existing documents. In doing so he differs in nothing from the other historical writers of the Old Testament. Nor is it unlikely that the great leader of the Exodus did not remodel and express in his own words what he had taken from other sources. If he were a modern writer, no doubt such would be his course, but in acting otherwise, and receiving into his work, more or less unaltered, the words of other writers, he would have been doing no more than following the usual mode of composition among his countrymen. We find nothing to quarrel with in the following extract from Dr. Driver (p. 3.)

The authors of the Hebrew historical books—except the shortest, as Ruth and Esther—do not, as a modern historian would do, *re-write* the matter in their own language; they excerpt from the sources at their disposal such passages as are suitable to their purpose, and incorporate them in their work, sometimes adding matter of their own, but often (as it seems) introducing only such modifications of form as are necessary for the purpose of fitting them together or accommodating them to their plan.

How then are we to reconcile the divergences of style, which Dr. Driver asserts he discovers in the first four books of the Pentateuch with the Mosaic authorship? Apparently he himself thinks (p. 149) that they cannot be reconciled with what he scoffingly terms “the journal theory” of the Pentateuch. If, indeed, the variety of style were only observable in the Book of Genesis, he thinks that something might be said for the theory of incorporated documents, but the fact that the same divergency is manifested throughout the Books of Exodus, Numbers, and Leviticus—we are leaving Deuteronomy aside for the present—seems to him completely to dispose of the theory.

We should say, then, that in that part of the Pentateuch which Dr. Driver terms the Priests’ Code, we have the direct composition of the great Hebrew Legislator himself. Many things go to favour such a supposition. It is the portion of

the Pentateuch which is acknowledged by all to form the groundwork of that sacred volume. It constitutes the greater part of the first four books of the Pentateuch, and forms the framework upon which the whole narrative is built up. It was composed after the remaining parts and necessarily pre-supposes their existence. Then taking the subject matter of the so-called Priests' Code, we find that it embraces that portion of the Pentateuch which we should naturally expect Moses, the Great Legislator, to have written down with his own hand. Dr. Driver admits (p. 6) that the unity of design in Genesis has long been acknowledged by critics. The so-called Priests' Code is the basis of that unity, forming the groundwork of the whole: other documents are only introduced to fill in the picture. Leviticus, the legislative book *par excellence* of the Pentateuch, belongs, as we should expect, in its entirety to the same writer. The Priests' Code, moreover, pervades the Book of Exodus, including thirteen whole chapters towards the end, which are taken up with the tabernacle and legislation in regard to the priesthood. Finally, to the same narrative belongs three-fourths of the Book of Numbers, concerned chiefly with rubries and legislation as to levites, festivals, vows, and other subjects requiring the special attention of the legislator himself.

But then, it may be asked, Whence did Moses take the narrative of the Exodus? It may be admitted as plausible, that he should have incorporated in the Book of Genesis certain documents relating to the early history of mankind. It is also clear that certain parts of the story of the wanderings in the desert belong to the so-called Priests' Code, and so may be said to have been written by Moses himself. But how comes it that we find embedded, even in the history of the Exodus, in which Moses himself took part, and of which he was the leader, certain long passages and extracts apparently in the same style as that of the foreign elements detected in Genesis? In a word, how comes it that the composite narrative JE., is found to pervade not only Genesis but also Exodus and Numbers?

During their sojourn in the land of Egypt the Hebrews were dwelling in a land where the art of writing had already, as is acknowledged by all, been practised for upwards

of a thousand years; indeed, assuming, as seems necessary, that the Exodus took place towards the close of the nineteenth dynasty, the most moderate calculation will place the age of the Great Pyramid at a thousand years before the departure of the Hebrews from the land of Egypt. Long before the time of Moses, even in the days of the fourth dynasty, we know that parchment was used as a writing material, and there are actually at present in certain European libraries, papyri, containing portions of the ritual called the "Book of the Dead," dating from the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties. Furthermore, at a very early period, perhaps as early as the pyramids, the artistic hieroglyphic character had been abbreviated and rounded so as to give place to a more suitable and easily practised form of writing—hence the cursive hieratic character. Of such writing we have a specimen dating from the eighteenth dynasty, and much of the papyrus Harris, entitled "the Records of Ramses III," belonging to the time of Moses, is written in the same character. Long before those days, even in the time Khufu, writing and literary composition were so far developed, that royal libraries and librarians were in existence, and even the Pharaohs themselves had turned authors.*

It is obvious therefore that in the time of Moses a literature existed in Egypt. Indeed, to his time belongs the papyrus Anastasi No. 1, in which we find the names of nine authors distinguished in theology, philosophy, history, and poetry. With theology, philosophy, and poetry, as they existed in Egypt in those days, we are not concerned, but it is important to note the fact, which indeed is made evident from many other independent sources, that, whilst the Hebrews were dwelling in Egypt, attention was given to the writing of history, and historians existed who had already distinguished themselves in that branch of literature.

Departing then from the highly civilised kingdom of Egypt, it is in no way surprising that Moses, who had received a high-class Egyptian education, should have established a body of scribes to write down, from old sources and reliable traditions, the early history of the human race and of the family of Abraham to the time of the Exodus.

* Archbishop Smith's Pentateuch.

Nor is it unlikely that he should have entrusted to the same men the task of keeping a record of the events of the wanderings, sometimes writing down facts that came under their own immediate observation, and were known to all the Israelites; at other times, recording events or copying down laws which had been communicated to them by the leader of the Exodus himself. It seems to us reasonable to suppose that such an account of the wanderings in the desert was written; for we do not know if, in the beginning of the Exodus, Moses had any intention of writing his great work; and it is very unlikely that for a long time after the Exodus began, he could have found the time, with his numberless anxieties and responsibilities, to devote himself to the task of recording, as accurately as we find them recorded in the Pentateuch, the events that happened in connection with the departure from Egypt. Not that Moses could not have had his memory strengthened in a miraculous manner; but, it is more in accordance with the manner in which we know the historical books of the Old Testament to have been composed, to suppose, that the writer, when he gives an accurate account of past events, has not dispensed with the ordinary means of attaining accurate knowledge, but is relying upon written authorities.

Now comes the question, what relation there is between this history, compiled by Hebrew scribes, and the present Pentateuch. We see no objection to supposing that Moses, when he set about the work of composing the Pentateuch, availed himself of the written account that already existed of the early history of mankind and of the events of the Exodus. In doing so, he acted after the ordinary manner of Hebrew writers, and transferred such passages as he required to his own work, without imparting to them, as a modern writer would do, the impress of his own style. Still he made it clear that he was the real author of the whole, the groundwork of the entire volume was his; he changed and explained and supplemented incorporated passages as he thought fit. He omitted wholesale at times, as witness the total silence as to most of the Exodus, because it was not to his purpose to dwell upon it; and finally he wrote, independently, the entire book of Leviticus.

Nor again, upon the supposition that we are supporting, is there any reason for surprise, that a certain piece of legislation was apparently written before the time one would expect, judging by its position in the Pentateuch. For very possibly it was written down by Moses, and recorded by the scribes, before he entered upon the composition of the Pentateuch. Then when he was engaged over that great work, he naturally incorporated the laws in the position best suited to them, though not necessarily always in Chronological order.

So then Moses seems to us to have written the first four books of the Pentateuch after the usual manner of the sacred historians of the Jews. Roughly speaking, the so-called Priests' Code seems to embrace that part of the narrative which is the direct composition of Moses; the composite narrative (JE.) to consist of the extracts he incorporated in his work, from a previously existing account of early history and the events of the Exodus.

The question now arises, how we are to explain the origin of the book of Deuteronomy. "Even though it were clear that the first four books of the Pentateuch were written by Moses, it would be difficult to sustain the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy," says Dr. Driver (p. 77). One point we are prepared to admit. If the same signs of composition pervaded Deuteronomy, which Dr. Driver asserts he discovers in the earlier parts of the Pentateuch, it would not be so easy to support its Mosaic authorship. For here we have a solemn and heart-felt exhortation of the aged patriarch to his people. We have a simple and straightforward laying before them of the law they have to follow, and it is unlikely that Moses would have, for the most part, sought for his words anywhere but in his own heart and mind. But as a matter of fact, all the attempts of criticism have been unable to controvert the unity of authorship of Deuteronomy, a unity which is a conspicuous sign of its Mosaic authorship.

Dr. Driver gives us a very good idea of the character of Deuteronomy, which it is important to notice (p. 72):—

In as far as it is a law-book, Deuteronomy may be described as a manual, which, without entering into technical details (almost the only exception is xiv., 3-20, which explains itself) would instruct the Israelite in the ordinary duties of life. It gives general directions as to the way in

which the annual feasts are to be kept and the principal offerings paid. It lays down a few fundamental rules concerning sacrifice: for a case in which technical skill would be required it refers to the priests. It prescribes the general principles by which family and domestic life is to be regulated, specifying a number of the cases most likely to arise. Justice is to be equitably and impartially administered. It prescribes a due position in the community to the prophet, and shows how even the monarchy may be so established as not to contravene the fundamental principles of the theocracy.

Again:—

Deuteronomy is, however, more than a mere code of laws; it is the expression of a profoundly ethical and religious spirit, which determines its character in every part. At the head of the hortatory introduction stands the Decalogue; and the First Commandment forms the text of the chapters which follow. (p. 72).

Finally:—

Duties, however, are not to be performed from secondary motives, such as fear, or dread of consequences: they are to be the spontaneous outcome of a heart from which every taint of worldliness has been removed, and which is penetrated by an all-absorbing sense of personal devotion to God. (p. 73).

In these passages we have given us a very good idea of the nature and spirit of the Book of Deuteronomy. But what to us seems strange is that the writer of these words should bring the following objection against its authorship by Moses:—

But the remarkable circumstance is that, as in the laws, so in the history, *Deuteronomy is dependent upon JE.....* An important conclusion follows from this fact. Inasmuch as, in our existing Pentateuch, JE. and P. constantly cross one another; the constant absence of any reference to P. can only be reasonably explained by one supposition, viz., that when Deuteronomy was composed JE. and P. were not yet united into a single work, and JE. alone formed the basis of Deuteronomy.* (p. 76).

The meaning of these words is clear. We are to believe that two independent and distinct narratives are welded together in the Pentateuch; that one of these was composed in the early days of the Monarchy, the other after the time of

* The Italics are Dr. Driver's.

Ezechiel. Deuteronomy is now declared to be based entirely upon the former of these documents, and to display "a constant absence of any reference" to the other. The conclusion is obvious. Deuteronomy was written after the first document (J.E.), and before the second (P.); in fact, as has been said before, about the time of the reign of king Manasseh.

No doubt, if it were true, that no allusion to the so-called Priests' Code occurs in Deuteronomy, it might seem strange from Dr. Driver's point of view. But as a matter of fact, odd as it may appear in conjunction with the passage just quoted, Dr. Driver has to admit, and strive to account for, as best he can, a very large number of allusions to that part of the Pentateuch, occurring in Deuteronomy. Thus, to take one instance out of many, after referring to certain parallel passages in Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code, Dr. Driver thus continues (p. 137) :—

Of these the most important is xiv., 4-20. Here is a long passage virtually identical in Deuteronomy and Leviticus; and that it is borrowed in Deuteronomy from P.—or at least from a priestly collection of Töröth—rather than conversely, appears from certain features of style which connect it with P. and not with Deuteronomy, and from the fact that verses 7, 9-10, 12, 20, seem most naturally *abbreviated* from Leviticus xi., 4-6, 9-12, 13, 21-22 respectively. If so, however, one part of P. was in existence when Deuteronomy was written; and a presumption at once arises that other parts were in existence also.

Dr. Driver, of course, does not hold this to be the case; but we on the other hand can reject as groundless the argument against the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, based upon the absence of allusions in it to the so-called Priestly Code. It is, moreover, interesting to note the kind of logic employed by modern criticism to compass its ends in these matters. We have it first brought forward as a proof of the non-existence of the Priestly Code in the time of the Deuteronomist, that there is "a constant absence of any reference to it" in that writer. Then later on we have it admitted that there are frequent allusions to the same document in the Book of Deuteronomy, and an attempt is made to show that these allusions do not necessarily show that the writer was acquainted with the whole.

But as a matter of fact the character of the legislation,

which is contained in that part of the Pentateuch known as Priests' Code, makes it unlikely that it would have been quoted in Deuteronomy as frequently as that contained in the remaining portion of the Pentateuch. Indeed, it is strange that modern critics do not make more allowance for that fact. If it be true then that the Priests' Code—whilst undoubtedly referred to in Deuteronomy—is less frequently used than the so-called narrative JE, the explanation of that fact is to be found in the character of Book of Deuteronomy itself. How could we expect to find in a general exhortation to goodness and observance of the law extracts from chapters dealing with the measurements of the tabernacle, the propitiatory, the candlestick, the lamp and the altar of incense? Surely it would have been beside the point in such a work, to have introduced long technical discussions as to the different kinds of sacrifices, the complicated ceremonial law of the priests, and other subjects contained in the Book of Leviticus. Such questions concerned the priests rather than the people, and would have been quite out of place in the Book of Deuteronomy.

On the other hand, the Decalogue and the more general and fundamental laws referring to justice, reverence for superiors, keeping of oaths and the like, contained in such parts of the Pentateuch as the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx., 23-23, 33), naturally find a place in the Book of Deuteronomy. Now a question may very naturally arise over this part of the subject. "Is it possible," one may say, "that we owe such a code as the Decalogue, and the collection of laws known as the Book of the Covenant to some unknown scribe, writing at the time of the Exodus; for the legislation that comes under both these heads appears as part of the document JE, and is not classed as belonging to the so-called Priestly Code?" It is true, indeed, that Dr. Driver inserts them in the composite narrative of the Pentateuch, called JE, but with such explanation as practically admits that they are not the work of the writer of that narrative. "The Decalogue was, of course," he says (p. 30), "derived by E. from a pre-existing source, at least the substance of it being engraved on the tables of the Ark, and incorporated by him in his narrative." So too in regard to the Book of the Covenant, "The laws

themselves are taken naturally from a pre-existing source, though their form, in particular cases, may be due to the compiler, who united J and E. into a whole" (p. 33). It comes to this then, that Dr. Driver knows nothing of the authorship of either of these passages; all he can say is that they were incorporated in the narrative of the Pentateuch known as JE. From our point of view, as far as critical science is concerned, we are at liberty to account as we please for the origin of these pieces; whilst we recognise it as most certain, that if Moses had established a body of scribes to write down the events of the Exodus, he would have handed over to them, to be recorded in their narrative, this most important legislation, the outcome of his mysterious visit to Sinai.

We have already quoted some passages from Dr. Driver, relative to the style of Deuteronomy, in which he seems to hold that it has no affinity at all with that of the Priestly Code. That statement will doubtless appear to us exaggerated, when we remember that we are told there is a uniform style throughout the entire book, and also that many passages are clearly taken from corresponding passages in the Priestly Code. But more than that Dr. Driver admits that "comparatively few exceptional words" are met with in Deuteronomy. In what then does the peculiarity of style of that book consist? Apparently in the frequent recurrence of particular words, phrases, and clauses, which gives a *distinctive colouring* to every part of the work; and also in the oratorical power which characterises it. In regard to the first of these reasons, however, we may remind Dr. Driver that he has already told us (p. 10) that there is a tendency to repetition in the so-called Priests' Code. "Sentences are cast with great frequency into the same mould; and particular formulæ are constantly repeated." If the recurring clauses are different in Deuteronomy, that is owing to the nature of the subject matter; just as the phrase "these are the generations of," whilst occurring eleven times in Genesis, occurs once only in the rest of the Pentateuch. As for the eloquence of Deuteronomy: that is what we should expect in such a book. The greater part of the Pentateuch is a legal document; and where it is historical, for the most part, the story has to be briefly told; and is taken up largely with genealogies and statistics. Still, who can

deny that a volume which has imprinted itself deeply upon the imagination of mankind for thousands of years is one abounding in genuine eloquence and oratorical power? But it is natural to suppose that oratory would be specially characteristic of the Book of Deuteronomy, the last address of the great patriarch to his people, in which he lays before them the benefits conferred upon them by God, and their obligations to Him, and at the same time exhorts them to keep His law.

One question still requires to be briefly discussed. "The journal theory" says Dr. Driver (p. 149), "takes a false view of the book of Joshua, which is not severed from the following books, and connected with the Pentateuch, for the purpose of satisfying the exigencies of a theory, but because this view of the book *is required by the facts*—a simple comparison of it with the Pentateuch showing, viz., that it is *really homogeneous with it*, and (especially in the P. sections) that it differs entirely from Joshua, Samuel, and Kings."*

Accordingly, throughout his discussion of the Hexateuch, Dr. Driver includes Joshua with the remaining five books, and partitions it out between the two narratives JE. and P., just as in the case of the Pentateuch. The result, if true, would of course upset the views we have been enunciating as to the composition of the Pentateuch: hence we have to devote a few words to the matter here.

There is no reason to suppose, in the case of the Book of Joshua, any more than any other of the historical books of the Old Testament, that it was composed by the author without the assistance of any written source. On the contrary it is but reasonable to suppose, if we conclude that a body of scribes was established for historical purposes by Moses in the desert, that they continued their work in the Promised Land, and that it is their narrative that Joshua incorporates in his book. So we have no difficulty in accounting for the apparent continuation of the narrative JE. in the Book of Joshua.

But Dr. Driver tells us that the same document P. appears in Joshua, which he discovers running through the first four books of the Pentateuch: and if the writer of the so-called

* The Italics are Dr. Driver's.

Priestly Code be Moses, how can we find the same writer appearing in the Book of Joshua. Briefly, we deny that the Priestly Code is continued in the Book of Joshua. No doubt the style of Joshua bears a very great resemblance to that of Moses, as we should expect. He had lived in close contact with Moses during the forty years of the wanderings, and had been chosen by his master for the task of completing the conquest of the Promised Land. Joshua had no doubt been present at the composition of much of the Pentateuch, and surely it is more than likely that he had been urged by Moses to complete the history of the Exodus, by writing an account of the conquest of Palestine. At all events, it is only natural to find that he has actually accomplished that task; and to recognise in the disciple traces of the style of his master.

One thing is quite certain, that Dr. Driver cannot find fault with us for this conclusion, since in this matter, we are but acting on his own principles. For when discussing the authorship of the Priestly Code, which is attributed by many modern critics to the prophet Ezechiel, owing to similarity of style, he dissents, using the following words : "The priests of each successive generation would adopt, as a matter of course, the technical formulæ, and other stereotyped expressions, which they learnt from their seniors, new terms, when they were introduced, being accommodated to the old moulds. Hence, no doubt, the similarity of Ezechiel's style to P., even where a definite law is not quoted by him" (p. 148). Can Dr. Driver object if we explain, upon the same principles, the similarity of style between the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, whilst maintaining that the writers were not the same ? What seems to us to be a strong confirmation of Joshua's authorship is the fact that, as Dr. Driver says (p. 97), "It (Joshua) seems to have passed through the hands of a writer who was strongly inclined with the spirit of Deuteronomy." Is not this just what we should expect from the faithful lieutenant, the successor of Moses, who carried on the government of the Hebrews to the best of his power, in the spirit of his old master.

Moses, therefore, wrote the Pentateuch. In the composition of that work, like the other historical writers of the Old

Testament, he made use of written sources ; freely admitting into his pages, perhaps, extracts from a previously existing history of the early days of mankind, and of the wanderings in the desert ; but stamping it all with the impress of his own mind ; altering and supplementing it as he thought fit, so as to bring it in conformity with fact, and to accomplish the great work imposed on him by God.

J. AIDAN HOWLETT.



SIX MONTHS AT THE GRANDE CHARTREUSE.

SO much has been written on the subject of this famous monastery, the home for 800 years of one of the most ancient Orders of the Catholic Church, and the only one that has never needed reform, that the reader may be tempted to turn away impatiently from an article bearing the above title.

The facilities for observation of Carthusian life afforded to the present writer have, however, been so complete, and at the same time unique, that this short sketch of daily life at the Grande Chartreuse may have an interest that the cursory observations of passing travellers must necessarily lack.

A visit to the Carthusians' classic home offered a great English poet, unhappily no longer with us, an occasion for the penning of some of his most beautiful stanzas; but their value, apart from the melodious cadence of which Matthew Arnold possessed the secret, is purely personal and psychological. It is the poet's mind under the influence of his strange surroundings that arrests and fixes the reader's attention, and forms the subject matter of the poem. The aim of these few pages is very different, namely, to give as far as may be a faithful transcript of experience; they contain no attempt to pronounce on any of the social or moral questions involved in the theory of monasticism, but a plain record of things seen and heard.

In the first days of November, 1888, I left England in order to enter the Noviciate at that venerable monastery, the Mother-house of the Carthusian Order. On the second day of my journey I was slowly mounting the narrow gorge that leads from the little village of St. Laurent du Pont to the Grande Chartreuse. The gaunt leafless beeches, *bare ruined choirs where late the sweet birds sang*, lined the road; the snow lay thick on the mountain and the piercing cold was but a cheerless welcome from nature. As we climbed the cold grew keener and the snow deeper, the beeches became almost entirely superseded by pines, while a dense white mist filled

the air, and congealing on our coats, frosted them over with a delicate crystal brine. The awful stillness, which like the Egyptian darkness could be felt in its tingling intensity, Nature lying motionless under her white grave-clothes, every feature of the scene seemed to whisper "Memento mori." It was a fitting approach to the shrine of Death and Eternity.

At last the monastery, rendered visible at fifty yards distance by the mist, was reached.

The jangling tones of the great bell echoed through the vast building, and I was soon inside the old Norman doorway, surmounted by the crest* and motto of the Order. A cheery lay brother welcomed me heartily, and, shouldering my luggage, led me to the guests' quarters, where I was glad to find a blazing fire. The father coadjutor, who is charged with the entertainment of visitors, soon appeared, and made me feel thoroughly at home by his genial courtesy. After a chat and a plentiful "maigre" supper—as meat may not be served, even to visitors, within the walls of a Chartreuse—I was glad to get to bed. The following day, which was Sunday, my friend the lay brother conducted me through interminable courts and cloisters to the Superior's cell. A tall, grand looking man of about sixty rose as I entered and welcomed me warmly, and after giving me some wise counsels on the arduous task that lay before me, accompanied me to the cell of the Novice Master, who was to be in the future my guide, philosopher, and friend. Don Julian, a keen-faced, intelligent-looking man, who retained as a recluse the enthusiasm which had distinguished him through many years of ministerial activity, was delighted to receive a new disciple, and after having embraced me on both cheeks, *more Gallico*, proposed, with the reverend father's full approval, to put me in my cell—*me mettre en cellule*—that very evening.

Accordingly, after vespers, the ceremony of my introduction to the cloister was performed. Inasmuch as it will be novel to most of my readers, I will describe it in detail. Don Julian washed and kissed my feet, reciting the Miserere, and then

* A globe surmounted by a cross and seven stars, representing the vision of the first Carthusians vouchsafed to St. Hugh of Grenoble, who recognised in the seven stars St. Bruno and his six companions. The motto of the Order is "Stat crux dum volvitur orbis"—"The cross stands firm while the planet revolves."

shod me in the manner peculiar to the Order, *i.e.*, in stockings of thick flannel, terminating in gaiters, over which were drawn flannel slippers, and finally a pair of square-toed, thick-soled shoes. Human ingenuity, by the end of the eleventh century, had not yet devised a garment that should be stocking and sock in one, and, conservative in this as in other points of greater importance, the Carthusians still follow the fashions of that far-off epoch. This survival in the modern Church of the old Eastern custom, familiar to readers of the Gospels, is full to the monastic mind of a holy and touching symbolism. Those who have read the discourses of St. Bernard to the monks of Clairvaux will remember the peculiar sanctity attached by that Father to the Monastery as such: the material building, once it was inhabited by the servants of the Almighty and consecrated to their use by the rites of the Church, became a shrine and a holy place. Hence the literal application of the divine command to Moses, "Put thy shoes from off thy feet for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground."

The pilgrim arrives from the world soiled and stained; before he is allowed to enter the holy place his feet are washed, the kiss of fraternity imprinted on them, and the Miserere is recited in order to signify the penitential meaning of the ceremony.

He does not put on again his own shoes, but is shod after the fashion of the servants of God in whose steps he is to follow. Like all the vestments now devoted to exclusively religious uses by the Catholic Church the divided stocking of the Carthusian to-day fraught with mystic meaning, was originally the ordinary garment of the world at large.

This ceremony concluded, the Novice-master conducted me to the cell I was to occupy. It was situated in the Great or Gothic Cloister which visitors to the Grande Chartreuse will call to mind as the only part of the 13th century monastery still standing.

Passing through a heavy oaken door over which ran the inscription—*This is the House of God and the Gate of Heaven, blessed are they that dwell therein*, we found ourselves in a passage 40 feet by 12 having a large cross painted at one end of it.

My guide explained to me that this was the *ambulacrum* and might serve for exercise so long as the weather should make garden work impossible, "Which will be for some time," he added, with a smiling glance through one of the two windows that lighted the passage at the state of my little garden, which was choked with snow. Then opening a door on the left with the words, "Here you will find rougher and therefore better work," he showed me the two ground-floor rooms, one a workshop containing carpenter's tools and a turning-lathe where I could amuse myself during the time allotted to manual labour and recreation, in making anything from an egg cup to a table and the other well stocked with wood which it would be my task to saw and cut into shape for my fire, a necessity in a region where the snow lies eight months a year. Then he led me up a small staircase to the other rooms, three in number, consisting of an ante-room, a living room, and a tiny library with just room for bookcase, chair and table. The ante-room was simply furnished with a few religious prints, a white stucco crucifix, and a large white statue of the Madonna, coloured objects of devotion being prohibited in the cells as contrary to the spirit of simplicity.

Lanspergius, a mediæval Carthusian Prior, well known to students of Christian mysticism as one of the claimants to the authorship of the "Imitation of Christ," introduced into his own monastery the custom of saying a "Hail Mary" before this Madonna on entering the cell, "*pour saluer la maîtresse de la maison*," as Don Julian explained. The mistress of the house saluted, we went on into the inner room which forms the real home of the monk. This room, the *Sancta Sanctorum* of his hermitage, is consecrated to complete solitude; from five to seven hours are passed there daily in solitary prayer and study, and though by special permission visitors, notably the monks charged with the instruction of novices in singing and manual labour, may enter the *ambulacrum*, no step save that of the recluse himself and the Superior ever cross the threshold of this cell within a cell. The only exceptions are the infirmarian and the doctor in time of sickness, and the whole community when the novice is first enclosed, and also when the life-long renunciation of the hermit is consummated by the Angel of Death.

A plain crucifix and a few devotional pictures, together with plaster statuettes of the Madonna, St. Joseph, and St. Bruno, form its only ornaments. Its furniture is composed of a stall and prie-dieu where the divine office not said in choir is recited, a plain wooden bedstead, a small table where the solitary eats his frugal meals, a stove, and a few chairs. Here and in choir is passed the life of the Carthusian. If those walls could have spoken, what tales they might have told of the conflicts of the anchorites they had enclosed for centuries! For my cell was in the oldest part of the cloister, and only a few doors from the one occupied by a famous monk of the Grande Chartreuse, St. Hugh whom Englishmen honour as the builder of Lincoln Cathedral, and a champion of the liberties of the English Church when a forerunner of Henry VIII. attempted to over-ride them.

The time that elapsed between entering the cloister and receiving the monastic habit was uneventful, being occupied in learning the details of Carthusian ritual, which is almost identical with that used in the Church of Lyons in the 12th century, and very different from the practice of the Church of to-day.

Some ten days later I was summoned to the Chapter House to receive the monastic habit. After receiving the kiss of peace from all the monks, the Novice-master led me to the sanctuary where I lay prostrate while the monks sang a particularly beautiful "*Veni Sancte Spiritus*." The hymn at an end, the monks formed into a line which was brought to a close by the Reverend Father and myself, in order to conduct me in procession to my cell. The Psalms "*In exitu Israel de Aegypto*" and the Miserere were sung on the way. The door of my cell being reached and opened, the Reverend Father first sprinkled the threshold with holy water, saying "Peace to this house," and then taking me by the hand led me upstairs, the community following, to the prie-dieu in the inner room, which prie-dieu, together with the stall, forms what is called the *Oratorium*. Here I knelt while the Prior continued to recite the prayers appointed by the ritual for the occasion. Finally he addressed me in the formula which admitted me to the privileges of a novice of the Order. "Don N., I place you in your cell and impose upon you

solitude and the 'labours' of the Order for the remission of your sins. From time to time a monk will visit you to instruct you in those things of which a novice should not be ignorant." Upon this we all returned to church and sang Vespers.

From this time my monastic life began in real earnest. It would be needlessly tedious to the reader if I continued to describe in successive detail my life as a novice, and such a proceeding would obviously exceed the limits to which this paper must be confined. I shall, moreover, be able to thoroughly initiate him into the mysteries of monastic life by describing to him the occupations of, first, an ordinary or ferial day and night, the nocturnal labours of the Order being by no means the least important; secondly, an extraordinary or festival day and night, indicating in each case the differences according to the time of year. To begin, then, with a ferial day. The monk charged with waking the brethren rings the bell at the door of the cell between half-past five and a quarter to six. The bell in question hangs over one's bed, and therefore can hardly fail to wake one. By half-past six the church bell is ringing for Prime of the day, followed by Tierce of Our Lady, or as it is called in the poetic phraseology of the Carthusian liturgy, *Tierge de Beata*. These offices are recited in the oratorium, the same ceremonies, such as bowing, uncovering the head, kneeling, etc., being used as in choir.

The offices recited, the monk remains in prayer at his oratory, until the bell summons him at a quarter to seven to the choir for the conventional mass, which is preceded by a quarter of an hour's silent adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. After this mass which is always sung, if the monk be a priest he goes to say his own mass, if not, he goes to serve someone else's, Priest and server reciting together at the foot of the altar Tierce of the day before the commencement of the Holy Sacrifice. If he be the server he recites during mass *Sext de Beata*, if the celebrant, he says that office after his thanksgiving. He returns to his cell at about 8-30, and spends the next half hour in making his bed and tidying his cell. At 9 he makes his meditation for half an hour, the rest of the time till 10 being employed in manual labour. At 10 summoned thereto by the bell he recites

Sext of the day in his oratory, he then goes downstairs and fetches his dinner from the little cupboard, or *guichet* as it is technically called, on the left of the outer door. He now recites a lengthy grace and then proceeds to eat his meal with, as far as my own experience goes, a remarkably healthy and vigorous appetite. Carthusian regulations are far too wisely ordered to burn the candle at both ends, and the meal is copious and excellently cooked, consisting of soup, fish, eggs, vegetables, cheese, butter, and fruit, washed down by a bottle of pure red Burgundy. Dinner is succeeded by an hour-and-a-half's recreation which could be spent very pleasantly in the summer in the garden, then half-an-hour's spiritual reading followed by study generally of some commentary on Scripture till 2. At 2, manual labour, and at 2-30 the bell sounds for *Vespers de Beata* in the oratory. At a quarter to 3 the solitary leaves his cell for the second and last time in the day to sing Vespers of the Great Office and Matins of the Dead in Choir.

Returning to his hermitage about 4, he studies for half an hour, and then eats his supper consisting generally of an omelette and a little salad and fruit. After supper half-an-hour's recreation followed by half-an-hour's examination of conscience and spiritual reading called in the Order the "Recollection." At a quarter to 6 Compline both of the day and *de Beata* recited in the oratory, and then at the pleasantest time of the day in the summer, to bed. Nor is it too early, for at a quarter to 11, he is again waked to recite Matins and Lauds *de Beata*, he spends the remaining time till the great bell sounds, in silent prayer, and at a quarter to 12 goes to Choir to sing Matins and Lauds of the night and Lauds of the Dead. Returning to his cell about a quarter-past 2, the Carthusian recites *Prime de Beata*, and again retires to his hard-earned repose till half-past 5. In the case of novices, a simply professed monk comes during the time allotted to manual labour in the morning to give instruction in the use of the lathe, etc., and during the recreation we went two or three times a week to the Novice Master's cell for a singing class. These little distractions were greatly prized at first, as also the daily visits to and from the Novice Master. The difference of régime in the winter consisted in

the fact that dinner was an hour later and None was said before, the supper consisting of any fragments of dessert the monk liked to save from dinner. This was during the Fast of the Order, lasting from the 14th of September (the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross) till Ash Wednesday, when the Fast of the Church began, which involved the singing of Vespers in Choir before the 12 o'clock dinner, and a supper consisting of a small piece of bread and a glass of wine, *Frustulum panis ne potus noceat*, says the old statute.

A feast day involved greater changes; the whole of the divine office was sung in church, and the meals were taken in the refectory. During dinner a monk sang portions of Scripture, arranged in such a manner that the whole of the Bible was read through, either in Church during the lessons of Matins, or in the refectory once a year. The night office on feast days was very much longer, the monks sometimes rising as early as ten and returning to their cells as late as a quarter to three.

"The world is crucified to me and I to the world," cried St. Paul, and the Carthusian re-echoes across the long ages with the same quiet confidence the Apostle's boast. For day after day passes and no change comes for the son of St. Bruno, who watches for the Dayspring alone, "a sparrow on the housetop." To-day is followed by to-morrow, the precise fellow of to-day, and the variations in his life, afforded by the change of the season, the Church's calendar or clostral rule recur so regularly as to be absorbed into the one cold, passionless stream of monastic monotony which carries him on to that great harbour by which all the days of his journeyings shall at length be swallowed up—that Day bright with the Everlasting Light when there shall be no more time.

One, however, of these variations I have not yet alluded to, and as it forms a marked characteristic of the life, it must not be passed over. I will ask the reader to accompany me one fine Monday morning to the Chapelle des Morts at about eleven o'clock. Dinner has been served earlier than usual, for to-day the weekly walk or *spatiamentum* is to be taken, a point of the rule the regular observance of which is felt, and justly, to be absolutely necessary to the due equilibrium of a healthy mind in a healthy body. The entire community is

assembled, and Father Vicar, having previously invoked the Holy Spirit, is reading a few sentences from the "Imitation of Christ."

The reading over, the monks go out in order of seniority. At the door they separate into two bands—the solemnly professed going with Father Vicar, the simply professed, who remain until they take their solemn vows, under the guardianship of the Novice Master with the novices. We walk on for two or three hundred yards in silence, until the Novice Master turns to the religious next him with the words, "*Laudetur Jesus Christus*" to which he receives the reply "*In saecula saeculorum.*" This is the signal for general conversation, in all cases, however, preceded by the above formula, with which a Carthusian always prefaces any remarks he may make at any time, even to a Superior.

The reader, if he be a man of the world, his mind stored with the news of two hemispheres contained in his daily paper, with the *on dits* of his clubs, and the floating gossip of the *chronique scandaleuse*, political or otherwise, may question whether out of the meagre elements at their disposal Carthusians are able to construct any conversation at all. But there are many things in heaven and earth not dreamt of in the philosophy that rules among light-hearted favourites of the gods, and among these things we may assuredly reckon a Carthusian recreation. Let us return to our novices who entered the forest that clothes the slopes of the mountain. They are chatting merrily, now of their progress at the turning-lathe, now of the mistakes in choir of the new Postulant, or of the chances of his perseverance. (Postulants, as those disciples who have not yet received the monastic habit are called, not unnaturally form a never-failing topic of conversation.) But the Novice-Master is calling "Silence," and a young monk mounts on a boulder and relates in simple language some events from the life of a Saint. The impromptu sermon over, the orator, whose rôle is taken in weekly turn by each member of the novitiate, is thanked by all and the walk continues. Here some novices are hanging on the words of an old monk, (for many enter the Order late in life) who was decorated for his valour in the war of '70. He is perhaps relating an incident of frequent occur-

rence, the rescue of the Blessed Sacrament from the heretical hands of the Prussian soldiery, or some piece of sharp hand-to-hand fighting in which he himself has taken part. Yonder some monks and novices, among whom we may notice the Novice Master enjoying himself as much as anyone, are laughing heartily over a story told by an old man who was for many years a village curé before he retired to the Chartreuse to prepare for death. It was a story he was fond of telling and as it a fair type of "good story" permitted and indeed highly appreciated *en Chartreuse*, the reader may pardon my inserting it. There was a village where both M. le Maire and the schoolmaster, the two most important personages in a French village, had obtained their offices mainly through their anticlerical opinions. The Préfet of the department being engaged in filling up the lunacy statistics had occasion to ask the Maire how many insane persons there were in his village. The Maire, whose qualifications for his post were comprised in one word anticlericalism, not knowing the meaning of the word "imbécile," went and asked the schoolmaster. That worthy replied "*Imbécile?*" The folk who go to mass, of course." The good Maire accordingly repaired the next Sunday to the parish church and counted heads. He then wrote as follows to the Préfet. "M. le Préfet, out of a population of 500 we have 350 imbéciles, I do not include M. le Curé since it is his vocation." Others would talk of their studies, questions of date and authenticity being sometimes hotly discussed. But while we have been listening to the monks' conversation, we have reached a tiny shrine of the Madonna known as "Notre Dame de la forêt." Here we kneel down and pray a little, and then a happy inspiration occurring to one of the monks, he intones the "Ave Maris Stella," which we all take up, singing it in parts with a pleasant effect. The little rock-hewn shrine, stained yellow-grey with moss and lichen, hung round with quaint exvotos (little waxen limbs and small pictures representing miraculous escapes from danger), peeps through the snow which covers the hills like a white velvet pall; here and there pierce giant rocks, black as iron, looking in their weird deformity like the maleficent Genii of the place struck into impotent stone by the spell of Christian holiness. Through the branches of the black-plumed pines the wind

[No. 2 of Fourth Series.]

o

croons a wailing requiem over the white-shrouded Brethren, dead and buried past recall, though their pulses have not yet ceased to tingle.

We go a little further and reach the crest of the hill, from which we look over a wide valley, in which we can detect through the shifting folds of the mist an occasional village. The Novice Master seems lost in thought: suddenly he turns to us and says, "My sons, there are souls in those villages we see at our feet who will be tempted to-day; let us say an Our Father and a Hail Mary that one mortal sin less may be committed there." We do so, and then turn homewards, arriving at the monastery in time for vespers.

The reader has now a clear notion of the externals of Carthusian life. But what of the spirit that informs them? What are the inmost thoughts of these solitary men, "silent while years engrave the brow?" What is the motive of these fastings, these tears, these vigils? To the Carthusian a blasé egotist who flies "no matter where out of the world" in search of a new sensation, or a cynic from mankind whose seclusion is the result of a hopeless pessimism. To these questions I will endeavour to reply shortly, relying on the principle that I have hitherto followed in this paper that the facts themselves form their own best advocate.

It is not necessary to recapitulate the principles that have guided mystics of all creeds and ages; the Carthusian is a perfect type of mysticism within the fold of the Catholic Church. Adoration and love of the good God, good in Himself and good to His children; the marriage of the soul by voluntary privation to the Divine Ascetic of Golgotha in order to co-operate with Him in the task of saving humanity; constant intercession in union with the Mater Dolorosa for the follies and sins of mankind; these tasks make up the lifework of the Carthusian. At midnight, while men are plunged either in sleep or feverishly pursuing the pleasures of sin with their "infinite sadness," he wends his lonely way through the chill cloisters to the church, where he unites with his brethren in gravely modulated chant. Let us take our stand in the visitors' gallery, and listen for a moment to these songs of Zion. The monks have entered and taken their places, and are standing white and motionless in their stalls; the church is in darkness

except for the faint glimmer of the sanctuary lamp. At length the Prior gives the signal, and through the silence of the night rises the pathetic everlasting cry of the children of men to their Father in Heaven, "O God incline unto mine aid," the deep-toned voice of the community continue the inspired words, "Lord, hasten to my help," and then profoundly bowing in lowly admiration, "Glory be to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost." And for two hours and more in alternate psalm and canticle these men of God will plead the cause of their brothers before the Throne of Infinite Mercy. Do you ask why this celibacy, why this self-sacrifice? What is seemly and right for the mass of men is not for those who have been caught up into the third heaven and there make intercession; the solemn duties of these high priests of humanity necessarily exclude the love of woman, the holy joys of paternity, and far more a life of unheroic though permitted comfort. To bear up under these stern conditions of life needs a clear, well-balanced mind, a spirit "touched to the finest issues," a stout courageous heart, quite incompatible with the hysterical fanaticism ascribed to the typical monk by hostile romancers. It is an old and true saying that one half of the world knows very little about the other; let the sceptical reader accompany me into a neighbouring cell to my own and see for himself. There kneels in prayer an aged man who was once an illustrious general* of the Russian Empire. When in middle life he resigned the helmet for the cowl, so invaluable had been his services to his country that the Czar wrote him an autograph letter thanking him for them, and settling on him a handsome pension for life. His form is bent nearly double with years, but the northern blue eyes flash as keenly as ever, while round the firm mouth plays a kindly half-humorous smile that shows that its wearer has gauged all human ambitions at their true value. Again, let us visit that other cell two doors farther on, over the door are inscribed the touching words from Holy Writ, "He shall give his beloved sleep." We ring, and a tall martial figure answers our summons. Our host this time was not many years ago an officer in the French Artillery, while he is

* Since the above lines were written I have heard of the death of this great man.—R. I. P.

courteously showing us over his tiny hermitage, let us glance at his story which he himself would never tell us. At an unusually early age he passed first out of the Ecole Polytechnique, and obtained his commission in the artillery. After a few years in the service he manifested an overpowering desire for solitude. He obtained leave, and retired to the Grande Chartreuse. His father, however, would not admit the reality of his son's vocation, and followed him to the monastery, where he showed so strong an objection to his becoming a religious that the Superior urged the would-be monk to respect for the time at least his father's wishes. He did so and returned to his regiment. In a year's time, during which he had obtained not only the cross of the Legion of Honour, but also his captaincy, an unprecedented step for so young an officer, and due only to his own merits, his father asked him whether his desire for monasticism was as strong as ever. On the young captain's replying in the affirmative the paternal veto was removed, and this time he was able to follow his vocation unopposed. He returned to the Chartreuse and laid his captain's commission and his cross on the table before the Reverend Father, with these simple words: "I return to you, Father, and give to God these things that I have gained in the meantime." There is now no holier monk in the convent. One more picture of Carthusian life, and I have done. We are in the Sacristan's cell adjoining the church, and the old man who for some thirty years has filled the office most coveted by the monk (for the post of Sacristan involves the special guardianship of the Lord's Body) lies dying. The community has assembled to support the "athlete of Christ" in the throes of his final struggle. The last sacraments have been administered, and the face of the dying saint is lit up with faith and devotion, for One fairer than the sons of men has come into that lowly cottage, and has taken His servant by the hand to lead him through the dark river. One by one the monks approach the little bed, and leaning over, kiss the sunken cheek, not forgetting their messages for Paradise. At last all is over, and the great bell tolls for the office of the dead. On the morrow we bury him, committing his body coffinless and clothed in his habit as he had lived to the ground where lie so many generations of

Carthusians, and a strange supernatural joy thrills the hearts of the brethren at the thought that one so recently among them now stands in the Holy City, face to face with the King in His beauty. Many an invocation will go up to Don Eugène in the days that follow, though they will not be unmixed with prayers for his soul's repose, for the Church in her prudence warns us that the holiness of even the best of us is but dull and smirched in the radiance of the infinite Purity. So live and die the Carthusians, and if we do not sympathise with their aims we can at least pay their courage the tribute of our reverence. The ascetic type is not popular, nor is it likely to become dangerously so in the immediate future. To dream of angels in a materialistic age is not a passport to social success; may it not, however, be remotely possible that the Carthusian may have chosen the better part which shall never be taken away from him?

ALGAR THOROLD.



ANGLICAN WRITERS AND THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS.

A PECULIAR importance attaches to the Council of Ephesus, in an historical point of view, from the fact that it is the first of the **Œ**cumenical Councils of which we have anything like a full and unquestioned narrative. Accordingly, we propose to test the Anglican theory of unity and independence by the history of this Council.

It must be remembered that that theory regards the most complete severance from the Apostolic See as compatible with membership in the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church ; and that it appeals especially to the Church of those four General Councils, which St. Gregory compared to the four Holy Gospels. We propose, therefore, to show, from a review of the Council and of the most prominent Anglican writers on the same, that nothing but the most complete misinterpretation of the Acts of the Council, could enable them to consider the above theory as in harmony with the teaching of the early Christian Church.

It will be seen that, in their accounts, some prominent features of the Council's witness have been slurred over, and others distorted ; that the salient feature of the Council, so far as the government of the Church is concerned, has been ignored and explained away. And in showing this, we shall impute no motives ; we shall simply state the facts of the case. Our hope is that some Anglican reader of these lines may be led to reconsider his position, on seeing that that position cannot be justified by an appeal to the principles which governed the Church's life in the age of the two first Councils, whose Acts are fully recorded. We desire no mere dialectical victory ; but that some earnest soul, which desires to live true to the Incarnate Word, may see that the truth of His Holy Incarnation was safeguarded by an institution of His own, and the Christian people were bound together in unity of Faith by a form of government, which was recognised as from Him, and which is to be found to-day only in the Holy Catholic and Roman Church.

The Council was concerned with the question of the union of the two natures in the One Divine Person of our Redeemer. Was it a substantial or an accidental union? The whole question of the world's salvation hung upon the answer. Both St. Celestine and St. Cyril emphasize this fact. St. Celestine, the Pope, in his letter to Nestorius says that "we complain that those words have been removed (*i.e.*, by Nestorius) which promise us the hope of all life and salvation." St. Cyril again and again strikes the same note. Dr. Salmon would have done well to have remembered this in his criticisms* on the great champion of the faith, St. Cyril, of Alexandria.

Up to the time of the Council of Ephesus expressions† had been used concerning the union of the two natures in Christ which were meant in an orthodox sense, but which were liable to misinterpretation. St. Ignatius had spoken of Christ as "bearing flesh;" Tertullian had described Him as "clothed with flesh;" and the early Fathers had often used the word "mixture" (*κρατσις*), of the union of the two natures.

But a term had been in use, which, if rightly understood, safeguarded the truth of the *ένωσις* of the two natures. We mean of course the term *Θεοτόκος*, or Mother of God, as applied to our Blessed Lady. The term had not been as thoroughly sifted, and authoritatively explained by the Church, as it was destined to be, owing to the heresy of Nestorius: but, as the Patriarch of Antioch bade Nestorius reflect, it had been in frequent use.

Nestorius had entered upon his career as Archbishop with the boast that if the Emperor would give him the earth cleared of heretics, he would give him heaven in exchange: and that if His Imperial Majesty would assist him in putting heretics to rout, he would assist him to do the same with his Persian foes. He was inexcusably cruel to his heterodox subjects; but he soon himself plunged into a heresy, which cut at the root of the Christian faith—attributing to our Divine Lord a human personality, and thereby denying the substantial union between the two natures. His writings found their way into Egypt, which was in the Patriarchate of Alexandria, presided

*Infallibility of the Church, p. 312.

†Cf. Catholic Dict., Council of Ephesus.

over at that time by the great St. Cyril. St. Cyril was consequently bound to take notice of the danger, and a correspondence ensued between him and Nestorius. St. Cyril, at length, appealed to Pope St. Celestine. He held off from this final step as long as he could, from the same feeling as St. Celestine himself expressed when he said that he could have wished never to have seen the letters of Nestorius, "lest I should be compelled to pass judgment on so serious a matter."

St. Celestine was a man full of zeal for the faith, and of great piety, judging from his beautiful letters.

Dr. Wordsworth appeals to him as the best judge of Cyril's character and conduct, although he mistakes Celestine's share in the affair of Nestorius. He says,

Perhaps there could not have been a more impartial judge of the parties in the struggle than the Bishop of Rome. Celestine was a calm spectator of the controversy, and in a review of it, it may be well to enumerate his letters as indicative of his bearing with regard to it, and also as a summary of its history.*

We shall presently see that St. Celestine was by no means a mere "spectator of the controversy," and that his letters by no means bear out Dr. Wordsworth's general review of the Council. But he shows a true instinct in taking the Pope's estimate of St. Cyril, in preference to that of the latter's enemies, as Dr. Salmon does.† For St. Celestine's estimate is that of all after time. "The Bishop of Rome" says Dr. Wordsworth, "did not suppose Cyril to have been actuated by any unworthy motives in this controversy."

St. Celestine on being appealed to by St. Cyril at once convoked a Synod, as was customary with the Bishops of Rome, and gave St. Cyril a full and emphatic answer. He authorised him to act for him judicially. So far St. Cyril's action towards Nestorius had been an office of charity, not an act of jurisdiction. He did not think that he would do well to excommunicate him from his own Church without consulting Celestine, although he says he might legitimately have done that much. When he wrote to the Egyptian monks he was writing

*Wordsworth's *Church History*, Vol. IV. pp. 232-3.

†*loc. cit.*

to people within his own jurisdiction*. But he had now laid the matter before one who could deal with cases that concerned the whole Church, and with the question of deposition as well as excommunication. The correspondence that passed between Alexandria and Rome on this occasion is, however, so important that, at the cost of repetition, we will give a summary of the two letters.

St. Cyril begins with giving his reason for breaking the silence which he had kept as long as he dared. The ancient customs of the churches (he says) persuade us to communicate such matters to your Holiness; I, therefore, write of necessity. Nestorius, (he says) from the commencement of his Episcopate has been disseminating amongst his own people, and the strangers who flock to Constantinople from all quarters, absurd ideas, contrary to the faith. He has sent Nestorius' homilies to Celestine. It was in his mind to tell him at once that he could no longer hold communion with him: but he thought it better to hold out to him a helping hand first and, exhort him by letters. Nestorius, however, only tried in every way to circumvent him. At last a Bishop, named Dorotheus, exclaimed in Nestorius' presence, "If any one shall call Mary the mother of God, let him be anathema." A crisis was reached by this expression. A great disturbance arose amongst the people of Constantinople. With few exceptions they refrained from Communion—nearly all the monasteries, and great part of the senate, for fear of receiving harm to their faith. He found, moreover, that Nestorius' writings had been introduced into Egypt, and in consequence had written an encyclical to the Egyptian monasteries to confirm them in the faith. Copies of this finding their way to Constantinople, Nestorius had resented Cyril's action. He accused Cyril of having read the Fathers wrongly. Cyril wrote direct to Nestorius, with a compendious exposition of the faith, exhorting him to conform to this. All the Bishops, says Cyril, are with me, especially those of Macedonia. Nestorius, however, considered that he alone understood the Scriptures. While all orthodox Bishops and Saints confess Christ to be God, and the Virgin to be the mother of God, Θεοτόκος, he alone who denies this is supposed, forsooth, to be in the right.

*Cf. Antifebronius vindicatus. Pt. 1, p. 506.

The people of Constantinople now began, says St. Cyril, to look for aid outside their province. St. Cyril felt that a "dispensation was entrusted to him," and that he should have to answer on the day of judgment for silence in this matter. He does not, however, feel that he can confidently withdraw himself from communion with Nestorius before communicating these things to his Holiness.

Deign, therefore, to decide what seems right (*τυπῶσαι τὸ δοκοῦν*), whether we ought to communicate at all with him, or to tell him plainly that no one communicates with a person who holds and teaches what he does. Farther, the purpose of your Holiness ought to be made known by letter to the most religious and God-loving Bishops of Macedonia, *and to all the Bishops of the East*, for we shall then give them, according to their desire, the opportunity of standing together in unity of soul and mind, and lead them to contend earnestly (*έπαγωνισάσθαι*) for the orthodox faith which is being attacked. As regards Nestorius, our fathers, who have said that the Holy Virgin is the Mother of God, are together with us, who are here to-day involved in anathema. For although he did not like to do this with his own lips, still, by sitting and listening to another, viz : Dorotheus, he has helped him to do it ; for immediately on coming from the throne he communicated him at the holy mysteries. He (St. Cyril) has therefore sent his Holiness the materials for forming a judgment.

St. Celestine in a beautiful letter, in answer, expresses his joy in the midst of sadness, at Cyril's purity of faith. He endorses his teaching, and embraces him in the Lord, as present in his letters. Still we are of one mind concerning Christ our Lord ! He compares Cyril to a good shepherd, and Nestorius not even to a hireling, but to a wolf, who is destroying his own sheep. Our Lord Jesus Christ, Whose own "generation" is questioned, shows us that we should toil for one sheep ; how much more for one shepherd ! We ought, therefore—

To shut him out from the sheep, unless there is hope of his conversion. This we earnestly desire. But if he persists, an open sentence must be passed on him. For a wound, when it affects the whole body, must be at once cut away. For what does he with those who are of one mind amongst themselves—he who considers that he alone knows what is best, and dissents from our faith ? Let then all those, whom he has removed remain in communion (with the Church) and give him to understand that he cannot be in communion with us, if he persists in this path of perversity in opposition to the Apostolic teaching. *Wherefore assuming the authority of our See, and acting in our stead, and place, with delegated authority (ἐξουσία), you shall execute a sentence of this kind (ἐκβιβαστίς ἀπόφασιν)*

not without strict severity, viz., that unless within ten days after this admonition of ours, he anathematizes, in written confession, his evil teaching, and promises for the future to confess the faith concerning the birth of Christ our God, which both the Church of Rome and that of your Holiness, *and the whole Christian religion* preaches, forthwith your Holiness will provide for that Church. And let him know that he is to be altogether removed from our body. . . . We have written the same to our brothers and fellow bishops John, Rufus, Juvenal, and Flavian, whereby *our judgment* concerning him, *yea rather, the judgment of Christ our Lord*, may be manifest.

It would be impossible to endorse with greater emphasis the claim involved in the papal supremacy, as understood at this hour, than is done by these two letters. "Confirm thy brethren" was the Divine injunction to the Prince of the Apostles; "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; thou, in thy turn, confirm thy brethren." Celestine was now exemplifying this law of the Church's life Dr. Döllinger parodies the Church's application of their text to the successor of St. Peter, when he calls it "far from being a guarantee of infallibility for every single dictum on an article of ecclesiastical doctrines." No theologian ever laid down such a childish application, nor did the Church ever call on Dr. Döllinger to believe it. He insinuates the same absurdity, when he says "the exhortation that Peter should strengthen his brethren by no means involves a promise that he would really do so *in every single instance*."^{*} But our Lord promises the security arising from His own prayer; and that security need not be and never was stretched to include "every single instance."

It will be admitted, however, that in the subject matter of Celestine's letter, the very foundations of our holy Faith were concerned. And Celestine did but add one more to the number of saintly Popes who had already been conspicuous for the support they rendered to the rest of the orthodox Bishops in the defence of the great mystery of our Faith—*e.g.*, St. Dionysius to one Bishop of Alexandria previous to the Arian struggle—St. Julius to another, the great Confessor Bishop of Alexandria, in the midst of that struggle—St. Damasus to the Bishops in general in the struggle with the Macedonian

* Declarations and Letters on the Vatican decrees. Eng. trans., p. 12.

heresy—and now St. Celestine to St. Cyril. And in each case the support was rendered by the See of St. Peter less in the way of argument than by a simple faithfulness to the tradition of the Church, more, that is, in a Divine than a human way, more by authority than skilful dialectic. Dr. Döllinger, in his time of rebellion against the Holy See, not unfrequently expressed his contempt for those who did not use the weapon of argument in the same way that he thought he could use it himself. He did, in fact, publicly dub with the name of "unscientific" all who disagreed with himself,* and he offered to enter upon a great public argument with his Archbishop and the Holy See in his long letter in reply to a call to submission.† But the Church lives on authority, not on argument, even as our Lord "spake as one having authority," and not as the Scribes and Pharisees, with all their subtle dialectic. Dr. Döllinger is anxious, in his "Declaration" recently published in English, to give the palm of theological acquirement to the East which gave birth to Arianism, Apollinarianism and Nestorianism. He will, however, hardly undo the brilliant work which he was enabled to do, whilst championing the Catholic Faith. In his "Declarations, &c." he speaks of the East "as having gradually overcome all false doctrines!" But he gives no new facts, whereas the opposite picture, drawn by himself in the zenith of his powers, bristles with facts. It is curious how Anglican writers seem to exult in the gratuitous assumptions and bitter lucubrations of the Professor's old age, to the neglect of the splendid literary productions of his younger days. And of all characteristics of his later writings the most painful is the continual exaltation of intellect to the disparagement of simple faith. A few pages further on he quotes St. Agatho's interpretation of the text from St. Luke, which we have just alluded to, and speaks of the Saint as "coupling with it the confession that at that time theological ignorance prevailed at Rome."‡ What St. Agatho really said was, that he sent to the Sixth Council Legates who were not versed in subtle interpretations of the Scriptures, such as had so frequently led the East astray, nor

* Cf. the *Times*, Jan. 18th, 1890.

† Cf. his letter to the Archbishop of Munich in *Declarations, &c.*

‡ *Declarations &c.*, p. 13.

were they illustrious in eloquence, but they had something better, viz., a full knowledge of the "tradition of the Apostolic See, as it has been maintained by my predecessors, the Apostolic Pontiffs." This was real history: and this they possessed. Nestorius evinced the same contempt for the Holy See, when condemned by it, that Dr. Döllinger did, and spoke slightlying of St. Celestine. Every one agreed that he was a man of piety; but he never parades his learning. Nestorius called him "one too simple to fathom the force of the doctrines." But as Dr. Pusey well remarks,* "It did not occur to Nestorius that Divine truth is seen by simple piety, not by proud intellect." The letters of Celestine are not devoid of argumentative power at times; they are, however, more the letters of a man of strong character in high authority than of the dialectician or the orator. He writes as one steeped in the writings of Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles. This particular letter to St. Cyril played a most important part in the history of Christian doctrine: for it was referred to as authoritative by the Council itself.

The two letters together, St. Cyril's and St. Celestine's, contain the following important points.

It was an "ancient custom," according to St. Cyril, for such important matters as the deposition of a heretical Archbishop of Constantinople, to be referred to Rome. St. Cyril says that he writes to Rome "as a matter of necessity." He does not even separate Nestorius from Communion with his own Patriarchate, until he has written to Rome.

He asks St. Celestine to prescribe what he judges best in the matter; to give the *formal decision* on this important case, and to notify his decision to all the Bishops of the East. Canon Bright merely calls this writing in "very deferential terms"** to the Bishop of Rome. Would it not surprise some of his Anglican readers to know *how* deferential the terms of St. Cyril's letter were? He uses a word which occurs again and again in the acts of the Councils in reference to the relation of the Pope to the condemnation of Nestorius, asking him *τυπωσαι τὸ δοκοῦν*—words which are a sort of refrain for a

* Introd. to some works of Cyril, p. 64. Lib. of the Fathers.

** Dict. of Chr. Biog. Art. Cyril. p. 766.

year to come. They form the keynote to the proceedings at Ephesus. Bossuet remarks upon this expression, that—

It signifies, in Greek, to declare juridically ; *τύπος* is a rule, a sentence, and *τυπώσαι τὸ δόκον* is to declare one's opinion judicially. The Pope alone could do it. Neither Cyril, nor any other Patriarch, had the power to depose Nestorius, who was not their subject : the Pope alone did it, and no one was found to exclaim against it, because his authority extended over all.

Next, St. Celestine adopts throughout his letter to Nestorius, sent with the above letter to Cyril, the same tone of authority as he uses in writing to Cyril. He writes with affectionate anxiety for Nestorius, but with the authority of office. He has no doubt about his prerogative of infallibility in such a matter, and does not hesitate to express his conviction.

Dean Church, in defending * his position and that of others, who appeal to the Early Church, says that he finds only a mitigated measure of authority "in the early and undivided Church, and there was no such thing known as Infallibility." And this he calls "a certain fact," including in the early and undivided Church the time of the great Councils. Dean Church's "certain fact," however, dissolves into a pure assumption, in view of the history of this third Council. It is confronted with 'certain facts,' involving the consciousness of Infallibility on the part of Popes, and the recognition of it on the part of orthodox Patriarchs, long before the Council of Ephesus ; but its recognition is so marked in the history of this Council, that the entire ground on which Dean Church and his friends, who remained in the Establishment, professed to stand, proves to be the veriest quicksand.

St. Celestine, on being appealed to by St. Cyril to formulate the decision as to Nestorius' excommunication and deposition, at once assumes his infallibility in such a grave matter. The Vatican decree does not go beyond his words, when he says of his own sentence on Nestorius, that it is not so much his, but rather it is "the Divine judgment of Christ our Lord;" and again to the Patriarch of Antioch, he says, "and let your Holiness know this sentence is passed by us, yea, rather by Christ (our) God." Just as afterwards the Synod writing to the Clergy of

* The Oxford Movement, by Dean Church, p. 185.

Constantinople, calls the executed sentence, being that of Pope and Council together, "the just sentence of the Holy Church and their divinely inspired judgment."

And again, Celestine is here pronouncing judgment as to what is preached by the "whole Christian religion," and decides to cut off Nestorius from the common unity.

Now, how is this all-important letter dealt with by Anglican writers?

Dr. Wordsworth speaks of it as being simply a statement of "the orthodox doctrine of the western fathers" upon the controversy.* Celestine, however, states that he is giving the doctrine of the Church of Rome and Alexandria and "the whole Christian religion," or, as he expresses it in his letter to Nestorius (going over the same ground), "the universal Church." Canon Bright† describes it thus (the italics are ours) :—

Celestine gave Cyril a commission of stringent character (Mansi iv., 1017). He was "to join the authority of the Roman See to *his own*," and on the part of Celestine, *as well as for himself*, to warn Nestorius that unless a written retraction were executed within ten days, giving assurance of his acceptance of the faith as to "Christ our God," which was held by the Churches of *Rome and Alexandria*, he would be excluded from the communion of *those Churches*, and provision would be made by them for the Church of Constantinople, *i.e.*, by the appointment of an orthodox bishop.

Now, St. Celestine does not use the words "join the authority of the Roman See to *his own*," which Canon Bright gives as a quotation. There is nothing in the Latin or Greek corresponding to "*his own*:" words which would suggest something more than the papal decision as the source of authority.‡ Neither does Celestine bid St. Cyril warn Nestorius "on the part of Celestine as well as for himself." He simply constitutes St. Cyril his "plenipotentiary," as Dr. Döllinger accurately expressed it.§ Neither, again, does Celestine speak of the faith held by the Churches of Rome and Alexandria simply, but he adds that it is that of the entire Christian world or

* Church History, vol iv., p. 210.

† Dictionary of Christian Biography, Art. Cyril, p. 766.

‡ Greek, σω. — Latin, 'adscitā' simply.

§ History of the Church, Period 2, Cap. iv, Sec. 3.

religion. And further, which is of much greater importance, he tells Nestorius in the same batch of letters which Cyril was to read and forward, that he will exclude him not from the communion of "those Churches" only, but from the communion also of the entire Christian Church. This latter point is of supreme importance, and we do not understand how Dr. Bright could omit it. In this very letter Celestine speaks of Nestorius being separated from "our body," by which from the contextual use of "our," he could not mean simply his own, nor only his own and Cyril's, but the whole body of the Church. Anyhow, in his letter to Nestorius, which St. Cyril was to read and forward, and which covers the same ground, the Pope says expressly that by this sentence, unless he retracts, he is cut off from the communion of "the whole Catholic Church (ab universalis te Ecclesiae Catholicae communione dejectum)." This is surely a vital point, and it is sorry history to tell the reader that Celestine bade Cyril warn Nestorius that he was to be cut off from the communion of "those Churches," viz.: Rome and Alexandria, when, as a matter of fact, he was telling him that he was cut off from the communion of the whole Catholic Church. They are words, too, which recur. For in writing to the clergy and people of Constantinople, the Pope repeats the sentence in full, which Cyril is to pass on Nestorius. And while he speaks again of the faiths held not only by the Churches of Rome and Alexandria, but by "the whole Catholic Church," he says that Nestorius is to be "excommunicated from the entire Catholic Church." The same occurs once more in the Pope's letter to John of Antioch. The Pope there again speaks as clothed with infallible authority, calling his sentence "the sentence passed by Christ our God," and it cuts Nestorius off from "the roll of Bishops" (*Episcoporum cœtu*).

St. Celestine, then comes before us at the Council of Ephesus as the foundation of the Church in a crisis of her life, when the reality of our Lord's redemption was at stake. For this was the real point at issue, as he himself and St. Cyril distinctly stated. He is the "confirmier" of the brethren. He feeds, or governs, the sheep of Christ, supplying them with the *Tύπος*, or authoritative judicial sentence, the form which was to govern their action. He resumes in himself the

Apostolic government of the Christian Church and uses the Patriarch of Alexandria, occupant of the second "throne" in Christendom, to execute his sentence. It was not then St. Leo who (to use Mr. Gore's expression), inaugurated "a school of thought" in accordance with "modern Roman" teaching on the subject of jurisdiction, and who, according to Dr. Littledale, revolutionized the Church's teaching; Celestine taught the same half a century before. There is one expression occurring again and again in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, which gives what might be called the Christian name of the Bishop of Rome. He is the Archbishop of "the Apostolic See, or Throne." It is curious to notice how Anglican writers fight shy of this title. Now Rome is, it is true, according to the Acts, the Apostolic Throne of greater, or old, Rome; but it is also, what no other is, simply "the Apostolic See." It is a title accorded to her by Emperors, Empresses, Patriarchs, individual Bishops, and the entire Synod. Dr. Littledale, seeing the force of the expression pleaded in his "Petrine Claims," that there is no definite article in the Latin. But let any one translate the various passages, especially in St. Augustine, and in the Acts of the Councils, with the indefinite article, "an Apostolic See," and see what perfect nonsense results. Besides, in numerous instances, we have the Greek which does give the definite article. We are a little ashamed of having to notice so absurd an objection: but it is necessary to include Dr. Littledale amongst Anglican writers, from the fact that his writings have had an enormous influence on the Church of England. The See of Rome, then, was, in 431, "the Apostolic See:" hers was "the" Apostolic throne; not, indeed to the exclusion of others, but in a super-eminent sense. During the Council of Ephesus, as a matter of fact, no other See is called Apostolical at all, unless we except a doubtful passage in the speech of Juvenal of Jerusalem, apropos of the action of John of Antioch: in which he calls his See the Apostolic throne of Jerusalem, but not simply "the Apostolic See." It will be as well, therefore, to preface our account of the actual proceedings of the Council with a succinct explanation of the Catholic teaching, as to the sense in which Rome is "*the* Apostolic See" in contradistinction to the other Sees of Christendom. For by this means we shall be able to see how

[No. 2 of Fourth Series.]

P

the action of the Church at Ephesus bears out the teaching of Rome to-day on this point.

The natural inference from the use of the term "the Apostolic See" as applied to Rome in the early councils is that the Apostolicity of the Church in the matter of government was vested in the See of Rome, and flowed forth from thence to the rest of the Sees of Christendom. This is the explanation which St. Leo gives in his Sermon on St. Peter and St. Paul's day. Canon Bright admits that "on the whole, what Rome said in 431, amounts to this: All Bishops succeed the Apostles, but Celestine as heir of him, who was the foremost Apostle, has a right to be foremost among Bishops."^{*} The question is, of course, what constitutes the "foremost place," and by what sort of "right" does Rome hold it? What did the Church at that date mean by so persistently attributing to Rome the title "Apostolic?" Canon Bright says that in 431, "Rome did not say, as she now practically says, 'The Apostolic authority is concentrated in St. Peter's successor.'" We are not quite sure what Dr. Bright means by "concentrated." But what is the explanation given by the history of the Council of Ephesus? It is as follows.

Celestine regarded himself and was considered by others, as occupant of "the Apostolic See." As such, he considered himself as, in a peculiar sense, clothed with Apostolic authority, which he exercised, for instance, in the act of deposing an Eastern Bishop, the Bishop of Constantinople, the Imperial City. No one in presence of the Acts of this Council will deny that much—viz. that he spoke of the authority of his See as Apostolic, and that Bishops (even Capreolus, of Carthage†) speak of it as such, and that Celestine regarded his sentence as the judgment of God.

But he regards all the Bishops as also true successors of the Apostles;‡ he rejoices in their gathering: he sees in their assembly a visible manifestation of the presence of the Holy Spirit, who is given to them all in common. He does not indeed say that all are *equally* partakers of the Holy Spirit, from an official point of view; that they all *equally* inherit

* Church History, p. 336. note d.

† Cf. Ep. Capreoli ad Syn. Act I.

‡ Cel. Ep. ad Syn. Act II.

the duties and graces of the Apostolate. Dr. Pusey, in his endeavours to find contradictions between Popes on matters of faith, says that Celestine, according to the "Roman" theory, must have been infallible when he said to the Council of Ephesus (the italics are his own) that—

The charge of teaching has descended [from the Apostles] *equally* upon all Bishops. We are all engaged in it *by an hereditary right*; all we who have come in their stead, preach in the name of the Lord to all countries in the world, according to what was said to them, "go ye and teach all nations." You are to observe, my brethren, that the order (mandatum) we have received is a general order or command, and that he intended that we should all execute it, when he charged them with it, as a duty devolving *equally* upon all. We ought all to enter into the labours of those *whom we have all succeeded in dignity.*"*

Not the Pope alone (in Dr. Pusey's comment on this his translation) but according to Pope Celestine, the "assembly of priests is the visible display of the presence of the Holy Ghost."

Dr. Pusey here gives a turn to Celestine's words, which neither the Greek nor Latin expresses. Celestine does not say that the assembly of priests is "*the* visible display," but merely that it "*manifests* (*ἐμφανίζει* testatur) the presence of the Holy Ghost," which is true, on what Dr. Pusey calls the Ultramontane theory. Neither does St. Celestine use the word "equally" at all; he says "in common," and a gift received in common may be received in diversity of share. St. Leo expressly anticipates Dr. Pusey's misinterpretation of Celestine's words, and gives the answer to his objection:—

Quibus cum dignitas sit communis, non est tamen ordo generalis; quoniam et inter beatissimos apostolos in similitudine honoris fuit quædam discretio potestatis; et cum omnium par esset electio (exactly St. Celestine's teaching) uni tamen datum est, ut ceteris superemineret. †

As for its not being "the Pope alone," as Dr. Pusey puts it, no one ever supposed that the Pope enjoys a monopoly of the gifts of the Holy Spirit for the purpose of teaching or governing. The same remark applies to what Canon Bright says—

It is certain that Celestine knew nothing of the theory which is now called "Ultramontane." He recognised Apostolic authority in all bishops alike.

* Eirenicon p. 307.

† S. Leonis Ep. Ed. Ballerini, col 691.

It is curious that in the text,* to which this is a note, Canon Bright, in giving the applauses of the Bishops at the Council, omits precisely the exclamation, which suggests the peculiarity of the Pope's position. The Bishops called Celestine "the guardian of the faith." Canon Bright omits that. If by the word "alike," in the above note, he means "equally," then he is contradicted by the whole of Celestine's conduct at the Council, and by the end of this very letter, as interpreted by Bossuet, who gives what must be admitted to be the interpretation that at any rate lies on the surface. If Dr. Bright does not mean "equally," viz., that all Bishops enjoyed, according to Celestine, equal Apostolic authority, but uses the word "alike" simply as redundant, he misinterprets the teaching to which he alludes. No Catholic theologian denies that the Bishops "all" enjoy Apostolic authority. As Hettinger expresses it,† "All receive the same authority, but not all in the *same degree* or to the *same extent*." And, as the same writer observes elsewhere, this does not the less make the Bishops true Bishops and true successors to the Apostles. For it will be admitted that Timothy and Titus were true Bishops, and yet they were under Apostolic authority. The Apostles had jurisdiction over the universal Church; and yet the Bishops appointed by them, under their jurisdiction, were true Bishops, placed by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God. The share of the Episcopate in the Apostolate of the Church is thus described by Hettinger:—

We know where to find the Catholic Episcopate, the Episcopate of the true Church of Christ, by the approbation its teaching receives from the Apostolic See: for where the members are in communion with their head, there is the unity appointed by God, the Catholic Church. . . . The Primacy and the Episcopacy are *both holders of the teaching office of the Church, but not ex aequo, on a par.* The head must teach the members and oblige them to accept his teaching; but the converse does not hold.‡

Bossuet, who insisted strongly on the Apostolic authority of all Bishops, nevertheless writes:—

When Christ chose St. Peter to be the foundation of His Church, He

* Church History, p. 336.

† Cf. "The Supremacy of the Apostolic See," by Hettinger. Eng. trans. Edited by Archbishop Porter, S.J. (Burns & Oates), p. 15.

‡ Do., Pt. 2, ch. 18.

created for him a superiority in the Church and conferred on him the fullest plenitude of authority and majesty, that he might keep all bound together in unity.†

And he tells us that Celestine acted in the persuasion that he alone could judicially deal with Nestorius. So that Dr. Pusey has no ground for translating Celestine's expression "in common" as though it were "equally;" and Canon Bright is mistaken in supposing that the attribution of *special* authority to the Holy See annihilates the Apostolic authority of the rest of the Episcopate. And each of these writers is mistaken in supposing that St. Celestine held the equality of all Bishops in their possession of the Apostolic dignity. They held it, according to St. Celestine, in common, but not in equal measure.

The execution, then, of the Pope's sentence was left to Cyril. Cyril at once wrote to John, the Bishop of Antioch, on the state of things. He entreats him to consider what he will do. St. Cyril must have been well aware that he was treading on delicate ground, for Nestorius had been recommended for the See of Constantinople by the Patriarch of Antioch. And the event proved how little John was to be depended upon. Cyril says :

We shall follow the decisions given by him (Celestine), fearing to lose the communion of such; (*i.e.*, the whole West) who have not been and are not angry with us on any other account; considering, too, that the judgment and movement is not about matters of little moment, but on behalf of the very faith, and of the Churches which are everywhere disturbed, and of the edification of the people.

In other words, it was an *ex Cathedra* judgment. It was on a matter of faith.

John of Antioch began well, and wrote to Nestorius, on receiving the Papal decision, urging him to submit, on the ground that, although the time given by the Pope, viz., ten days, was indeed short, still it was a matter in which obedience need not be a matter of days even, but of a single hour; and that the term "Mother of God," although capable of abuse, was one which the Fathers had used, and which, therefore, Nestorius could consent to use, attaching to it his own

+ Def. decl. Cler. Gall. xxi.

doubtless orthodox meaning. The letter, although urging obedience, differs in its tone from Cyril's, and gives us already a glimpse of a spirit that subsequently led John of Antioch into schismatic action at Ephesus.

St. Cyril wrote also to Juvenal, of Jerusalem, exhorting him to assist in writing both to Nestorius and to the people in accordance with the prescribed decree (*όρισθεντα τύπον*) i.e., the papal decision; and suggested that pressure should be brought to bear upon the Emperors.

Meanwhile Cyril had summoned a Synod at Alexandria, and in conjunction with the Bishops, he drew up twelve anathematisms, which he forwarded to Nestorius with the papal sentence.

Nestorius, who had already appealed to the Pope to know what ought to be done about certain supposed disseminators of Apollinarian errors, with which he ceaselessly charged St. Cyril, replied with twelve counter anathematisms, full of erroneous doctrine. But he had devised another plan for staying the execution of the sentence. Like all heretics, he appealed to the civil power. In this he was probably prompted and joined by others, for there were at that time in Constantinople some disaffected spirits connected with Antioch. This city—that first heard the name of Christian applied to the followers of Jesus Christ—honoured by the Church as one of the three Sees of Peter—the third “throne” in Christendom—had long proved a nursery of heretical teaching and religious dissension. Nestorius himself came from Antioch. Whilst there, he had come across Theodore, of Mopsuestia, the pupil of Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, who was the fountain, so far as we can trace things upwards, of all the mischief which occasioned the Council of Ephesus. In opposing Apollinarianism, Diodorus had lost the balance of faith, and taught that the union of Godhead and Manhood in the Redeemer was not of substance with substance, but of two personalities; a union of name, authority, and honour. Theodore imbibed his error, and so great and lasting was the magic of Theodore's name that his memory had to be condemned in the Sixth Council. Nestorius had come under Theodore's influence. John, of Antioch, in urging Nestorius to obey the papal decision, alluded

to Theodore's withdrawal of certain erroneous expressions, as an encouragement. Being both of Antioch, they understood the value of such an appeal. But there was another of Theodore's pupils, the Bishop Julian, a fellow-countryman of Nestorius, who entered into the lists with St. Augustine in favour of Pelagianism, and, with the usual modesty of heretics, compared himself to David and Augustine to Goliath. This Julian had been deposed by the Holy See for his Pelagian teaching, and previous to the emergence of Nestorianism had found his way to Constantinople with some others in the hope of moving the Emperor to call a Council to reverse the sentence of the Pope. Two successive Bishops of Constantinople had refused to present him at Court. But it seems, from Celestine's letter to Nestorius, that the latter was on too friendly terms with Julian to please the Pope, and that but for his fear of Celestine he would have presented Julian to the Emperor. When the See of Constantinople was vacant, Celestine had been anxious about its future occupant for this very reason, lest he should be one that would use his privilege of introduction in favour of such ecclesiastical "lepers" as Julian, and lead his Imperial Majesty to call a Council for no adequate reason, and so simply disturb the peace of the Church. St. Augustine and the African Church had expressed themselves satisfied with the ruling of the Holy See in regard to Pelagianism. The expression "*Roma locuta est: causa finita est*," though not the actual words of St. Augustine, are the exact equivalent of what he did say. "The rescripts have come," i.e., from Rome (which are St. Augustine's words) is the same as "Rome has spoken;" and the "case is finished" are his actual words. Capreolus, Bishop of Carthage, writing in the name of the African Church to the Synod, goes out of his way to press this point, that the Bishops of Africa had accepted the decision of the Holy See, and that the Synod of Ephesus had no right to re-open matters already settled by such authority. He speaks of novel doctrines which "the authority of the Apostolic See and the judgment of the Bishops agreeing together has defeated," and submits that to treat these as open questions would be to discover a lack of faith. It is not easy to determine exactly how much Capreolus intended to include in these doctrines which had thus been

"crushed." The expression "antehac" seems to point to Nestorianism, as having been in his judgment practically crushed by the papal sentence and the agreement of so many Bishops; on the other hand the expression "dudum" seems to us conclusive in favour of the idea that Capreolus's words alluded to the endeavours of Julian and other Pelagians to re-open their case before a General Council. As a matter of fact, the Synod of Ephesus did allude to their case, not to re-open it, but to signify in express terms their adhesion "*en bloc*" to the decisions of the Holy See. Julian, however, hoped much from a Council, and seeing his opportunity in the appointment of Nestorius to the See of Constantinople, appears to have drawn him into a favourable inclination towards himself, which led him to sound Celestine as to what could be done in regard to such as Julian.* There was, indeed, a natural affinity between their heresies. "Where Pelagius ends, Nestorius begins," said St. Prosper; and "Nestorius erred concerning the head: Pelagius concerning the body," said a Council of Western Bishops.†

Nestorius then, probably assisted by Julian, turned to the Emperor, and made for a General Council. St. Cyril had sent four Egyptian Bishops to Constantinople to deliver the letters of Celestine and himself to Nestorius with all due circumstance, and Nestorius seems to have been aware of their contents. But before they could reach Constantinople he had represented to the Emperor that the Church was in a state of disturbance, and needed the remedy of a General Council. Dr. Littledale says that "*the Pope joined* in a petition to the Emperor to convoke a General Council as the only means of settling the dispute,"‡—a flight of absurdity which we may leave to Canon Bright to correct, who says that "Celestine and Cyril were obliged to acquiesce in the decision of the Emperor to convoke an Ecumenical Synod to meet at Ephesus on the following Whitsunday (June 4th, 431) at the request of Nestorius." We do not know on what authority Canon Bright speaks of the Pope and St. Cyril as "obliged" to acquiesce. The state of things in Constantinople, owing to the presence of Julian and

* Ep. Celest. ad Nest.

+ Cf. Chr. Lupus Append. to Scholia on the Canons of Ephesus.

‡ Petrine Claims, p. 98.

other deposed Bishops, may have made Celestine reluctant; but the letter to the Synod is full of rejoicing at its gathering. However that may be, St. Celestine gave his consent, and St. Leo's summary of the Council is that it was " convoked by the precept of Christian Princes and the consent of the Apostolical See"—a summary which we prefer to Canon Bright,* who does not mention "the consent of the Apostolical See."† Nestorius appears to have worked his plan well. He accused St. Cyril of Apollinarianism, and of generally disturbing the peace of the Church. And it is important to remember that it was to settle the question between Cyril and Nestorius, that the Emperor, Theodosius II., summoned the Metropolitans of the East, and a certain number of attendant Bishops to Ephesus. It was with no idea of settling matters between Rome and Nestorius; for the Emperor had received no intimation of the sentence passed by Celestine. The idea in the mind of the Emperor was that Cyril should be on his trial as a disturber of the peace, and a restorer of Apollinarianism, and he probably expected Nestorius to take the prominent position. He disliked Cyril, and specially resented his attempt to secure the sympathy of the two Queens on the side of orthodoxy. He was just then growing jealous of Pulcheria's increasing influence, and Cyril had written her a long and magnificent letter on the doctrine of the Incarnation. We know also, from a letter of Cyril's that Nestorius hoped to be President. The Council was thus, as Dr. Pusey has well remarked a "device of Nestorius"‡, although it had been seconded by the monks who had been ill-treated by him, and had urged the Emperor in their despair to convoke a general Synod. They did not know what had been done at Rome.

But on arriving at Ephesus some time before Pentecost

*Bright's Notes on the Canons of the first four Councils, p. 110.

†Preface to Notes, &c. p. 6.

‡Dr. Pusey's account of the Council, written quite at the end of his life, as a Preface, or a continuation of his son's preface, to some works of St. Cyril, is, to our minds, the best account of the Council that any Anglican has written. He very successfully clears St. Cyril from the suspensions on his character, which Dr. Salmon repeats. In that particular point, Dr. Wordsworth and Dr. Bright are honourable exceptions to the usual Anglican view of the great saint. Even Dr. Newman, in his Anglican days, falls far below these three writers in the matter. (*Histor. Sketches*) And Dr. Salmon ought not to quote his estimate of Cyril, as that of "Cardinal" Newman, without noticing the preface which he prefixed as Cardinal.

in the hope, doubtless, of influencing the inauguration of the Council, Nestorius was rudely undeceived by the attitude which Mennon, the Bishop of the Diocese, assumed at once towards himself and his episcopal sympathisers. The doors of St. Mary's Church were closed against them. They complained to the Emperor that they could not celebrate the Liturgy of Pentecost in the Churches of Ephesus. Bishop after Bishop on arriving must have strengthened Nestorius' conviction that the Papal sentence was accepted, and that the Bishops had come, as Count Candidian, the Imperial Commissioner, afterwards complained* not so much to investigate, as to execute a sentence already passed. Accordingly, when the day came, Nestorius absented himself from the Synod. The day of Pentecost had come, and John, Patriarch of Antioch, had not arrived. Day after day passed, and no Bishop of Antioch. At length Bishops came with a message from him that they were not to wait. Some Bishops had already fallen ill, many felt the fearful pressure of the want of accommodation, and at last some of them died. As they said the Requiem Mass of one Bishop after another, the survivors must have felt keenly the cruelty of the Patriarch of Antioch's procrastination. They knew it to be of set purpose. The Synod in its report to the Emperor assured him of their conviction that John was delaying from the desire not to be present at Nestorius' condemnation. He allowed friendship to gain the day over zeal for the truth. Accordingly, the Bishops began to "cry out" † against Cyril for not beginning; and Cyril yielded to their wishes, himself convinced that John, of Antioch, did not wish to be present. On the 16th day after Pentecost the Synod began its sessions. Dr. Salmon's caustic remarks on the disorderliness of the Councils of the Church certainly do not apply to the sessions themselves. He ignores the judicial, orderly, and even majestic tone of the Synod itself, and gathers his description from circumstances that took place outside the walls of the church, and he relies for his "history" on the accounts of the schismatics, and further includes in the "Councils of the Church" the Robber Council of Ephesus which succeeded the

* Cf. *Acta Conciliabuli adv. Cyrillum.*

† Cf. *Ep. Cyr. ad Cler Constantin.*

Ecumenical Council.* No wonder he can speak so slightingly of Councils, when he confuses "concilia" and "conciliabula," and prefers the accounts of heretics to the narratives of the Synod itself. The letter of the Synod to the Pope would have quite spoilt his thesis, if he had taken that for his authority instead of the letter of the schismatics to the Emperor. The sessions of the Council were, as we have said, orderly, judicial, and majestic. Cyril presided in the name of Celestine, "as plenipotentiary of the Pope," to use the words of Döllinger.†

According to Dr. Salmon, "the theory had not yet been heard of in the East, which would ascribe the headship of all Councils to the Bishop of Rome, present or absent."‡ The Bishops of Chalcedon, who asked for delay that they might understand, and thus give an intelligent adhesion to the tome of St. Leo thought otherwise, for they speak of the Council of Ephesus as that "of which the most blessed Celestine, the president of the Apostolic chair, and the most blessed Cyril of great Alexandria, were the governors or presidents,"§ whilst the Council of Chalcedon, in its definition of faith, expressly says that the Council of Ephesus was presided over by "Celestine and Cyril." And the Emperors, in their letter after the Council of Chalcedon, confirming the sentence against Eutyches and the monks who sympathised with him, speak of the Ephesine Synod as the occasion "when the error of Nestorius was excluded, under the presidency of Celestine, of the city of Rome, and Cyril, of the city of Alexandria." The Empress Pulcheria uses the same expression. We have, too, a large number of letters from various Bishops to the Emperor Leo, written after the Council of Chalcedon, in reference to the troubles at Alexandria under Bishop Timothy, most of which allude to the Council of Ephesus, and attribute the presidency to Celestine as well as to Cyril. For instance, certain European Bishops (and we presume that Dr. Salmon will not rule their witness out of court, coinciding as it does with the 600 Bishops of Chalcedon, almost all of them Eastern) depose that the Council of Ephesus was gathered together "under

* Infall. of the Church, p. 313 et seq.

† Hist. of the Church Period II., cap. iv., sec. 3.

‡ Loc. cit. § Κυβερνήται

Celestine, of blessed memory, the successor of the holy and venerable Peter, the guardian of the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and under Cyril, Pontiff of Alexandria, of holy memory." And the Bishops of the province of Isauria speak of Cyril, "who formerly governed the Church of Alexandria, and openly fought against the folly of Nestorius, and was partaker with blessed Celestine, the Shepherd of the *Safe* Church of the Romans." This latter, however, does not necessarily involve presidency. But Julian, Bishop of Cos, in his letter to the Emperor calls the Council of Ephesus that over which presided the thrice blessed "and most holy Fathers, Celestine, Pontiff of the Roman city, and Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria." And again, the Bishops of Upper Armenia call the Council that "of which the presidents were Celestine and Cyril . . . who chiefly shone for them against the wicked blasphemy of Nestorius." We can assure Dr. Salmon that these are but specimens of our notes from the letters of the Bishops, and that only want of space prevents our multiplying them.

St. Celestine, then, was the real president of the Council, but he presided through St. Cyril, who sat in his name. Canon Bright says that Cyril presided "not in virtue of the commission from Celestine to act in his stead, which had already been acted upon in the Alexandrian Council of November—but as the prelate of highest dignity then present, and as holding the proxy and representing the mind of the Roman Bishop, until the Roman legates should arrive."^{*} But the Acts expressly state, again and again, that Cyril held not "the proxy," but "the place" of Celestine. And it does not follow, because the original commission had been "acted upon" in November, that it had been exhausted in June.

St. Cyril's position was probably due to two causes: First, as the Bishop of Alexandria, the second "See of Peter," he was the natural representative of the Bishop of Rome; and, secondly, he had been originally commissioned by Celestine to act "in our stead and place," in "the affairs" of Nestorius. Those "affairs" were not yet finished, and there had been no limitation in point of time, nor subsequent withdrawal, in

* Dict. of Chr. Biogr., p. 706.

respect of his commission. That Cyril considered himself to be acting as the representative of Celestine, by his commission, appears from his question to Celestine, asking him what he should do in case of Nestorius' retraction. The commission did not express his duty in that event; and Cyril accordingly wrote, as we know from Celestine's letter,* to know what his duty would be under such a happy circumstance. He wanted to know whether he should treat Nestorius as no longer a Bishop, now that the ten days' grace had elapsed. It is certain from this that St. Cyril considered Celestine's sentence as final, and that he only consented to deal with Nestorius as a Bishop by reason of Celestine's permission, which accorded to the heretic a fresh opportunity of retraction. St. Celestine says that he leaves that matter to Cyril, in conjunction with the Synod. "It belongs to your Holiness," are the Pope's words, "with the venerable counsel of the brethren, to put down the disturbances that have arisen in the Church, and that we should learn that the matter has been completed (God helping) by the desired correction." St. Celestine also says that if Nestorius continues in his sin, he will reap the fruit of what will be his own act, *manentibus statutis prioribus*, the previous decisions remaining in force. It is, therefore, clear that the Pope's sentence was not so much suspended as devolved upon the Council. Had the Emperor been orthodox, and not caught by the wiles of Nestorius, he would not have been as keen about the Council as he was. The Pope, however, acted in accordance with the rule which St. Gregory the Great laid down in such matters, viz., that of submitting to the Imperial wishes when they did not run counter to the Canons. He expresses the fullest confidence in Cyril and the Council, that they will execute the sentence he had passed, with the more solemn apparatus of a conciliar adhesion to the *τύπος* which he had sent to Cyril, Nestorius, and John of Antioch.† He looked upon Cyril as the teacher of the Council, and virtually owns the commission originally given as still running. The Council, therefore, acted with the full permission of the Pope in utilising the Imperial convention for giving Nestorius every

* Ep. Cel. ad Cyr. in fine Act ii.

† Ep. ad. Syn. in fine.

chance of repentance before executing the original sentence, and St. Cyril acted under commission from the Pope.

There is a letter extant, written by two Alexandrian clerics towards the end of this century, and used by the episcopal legates from Pope Anastasius to the Emperor of the same name, which comprises the views of St. Cyril's position, on which we have been writing. In this letter they say that "whenever in doubtful matters any Councils of Bishops are held, His Holiness, who presides over the Church of Rome, used to select the most rev. Archbishop of Alexandria to undertake the charge of his own place." In the case of the Ephesine Council, it was doubly natural that the patriarch of Alexandria should be "selected" by Celestine as being the foremost champion of the truth assailed, and as having already had to deal with it in Celestine's name.

There were also peculiar circumstances in this case which would have rendered it difficult for St. Cyril to have assumed that Presidency with any chance of success, unless he had had such a special intimation of the Pope's wish in the matter as we have given above, or felt that he was but continuing on the lines of the original commission from Celestine to execute his sentence. For that it was for this purpose that the Council, despite the ideas of the Emperor, considered itself convoked, will presently appear.

The circumstances that rendered the position peculiarly difficult for St. Cyril were these. At the first session, the Imperial letter, which called the Bishops together, appears to have been read, at the suggestion of Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, by Peter, the Alexandrian notary, and the question was then asked how long an interval had elapsed since the day fixed by the Emperor for the meeting of the Synod. Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus, gave the number of days, and, immediately upon this St. Cyril proposed that without further delay they should proceed to business, speaking of a "second decree" which he says had been read to them by Count Candidian, the Imperial representative. But there is no mention, in the Act, of this decree having been read. There is, therefore, a hiatus in the record, which has been either mutilated or abbreviated. But the account of the schismatic Synod held by John of Antioch on his arrival, supplies a key to

the missing portion of the record. That Synod laid the greatest stress on the infringement, by Cyril and Memnon, of the Imperial decree. Count Candidian told them he had been induced to read that decree under great pressure. He wished to wait for John, before reading it, probably a device for putting off the Synod. But Cyril compelled him to read it, on the ground that otherwise they could not know the Emperor's desires. Now they knew, apart from this, that the Emperor desired them to meet at Pentecost, and that all the Metropolitans available were to attend. The decree therefore could not have related solely or principally to that point. The copy, as we have it, is without the same formal ending as that which was read by Peter, and so we cannot be sure that we have the whole of it. Indeed, its recovery at all, is of late date, and the two copies are not in perfect agreement. And Nestorius' letter to the Emperor adds one point which is not in the decree as we have it.

It would seem, then, that this decree (*θέμισμα*) which is to be distinguished from the letter (*γράμμα*) read by Peter, contained some fuller provision for the ordering of the Council, which was set aside by the Council itself. The letters of the schismatics to the Synod, to the Emperors, to the Empress, to the Clergy of Constantinople, and to its Senate, all speak of the violation of this Imperial decree. In the letter of the schismatics to the Emperor they speak of John's absence from the Synod under Cyril as contrary to his order, and add that the Council had also infringed the Imperial decree, as though in some further way.

In point of fact, we learn from St. Cyril that Nestorius had hoped to preside at the Council. The Emperor, we know, considered Cyril the guilty party. And it seems probable that Nestorius, by accusing Cyril of Apollinarianism, and by his dexterous management of the Emperor, hoped to turn the Council into an occasion of examining Cyril. Count Irenaeus, in writing to the Orientals, says that if the right order, *i.e.*, that which the Emperor prescribed, had been observed, the constitution of the Council would have been different, and the "Egyptian" (as he called St. Cyril) "would not have had it in his power" to condemn Nestorius. We may presume that

only two Bishops would have attended each Metropolitan,* and those only such as, according to Nestorius' conceit, understood such matters;† and we know that Count Irenaeus also meant that Cyril *would not have sat as judge, being himself one of those under trial* (*οὐδὲ κρίνειν ὡς εἰς ὁν τῶν κρινομένων ἤδονατο*); nor, continues the Count, "would he have been able to touch the matter at all, acting as he did, contrary to the judgment of the most noble Count Candidian"—from which it is evident that Candidian's contention was that Cyril could not sit as judge of Nestorius. In fact, the Imperial decree must have resembled that of Constantine in regard to the Council of Tyre, and the order of Theodosius later on, by which he assigned the presidency of the Robber-Council to Dioscorus. All this was contrary to the Canons. And accordingly, at the Council of Ephesus, St. Cyril, either ignoring that part of the decree which related to the mode of procedure, and in obedience only to the rest, or by the expressed desire of the Council, or producing the commission he had received from Celestine, continued to occupy the president's seat; and the Council preferred the Canons, and the papal appointment, to the Imperial decree. Candidian left the Council on the ground, as he said afterwards,‡ that he considered the Imperial decree was not going to be obeyed. He had been compelled by Cyril to read the decree against his wish. And he must have seen very plainly that the condemnation of Nestorius was a foregone conclusion. There is no reason, on this interpretation, to suppose that Count Candidian told a barefaced lie, as the scholiast notes in the margin: but merely that he was an Erastian, and sympathised with Nestorius. He would have liked Cyril to have been placed, as it were, in the witness box; he would have liked a discussion as to what the Church believed on the doctrinal question; whereas there was to be no real discussion, but all would be settled by acclamation, and Bishops would simply testify to the faith in which they had been baptised, and to the guardianship of which they had been consecrated to their high office. So he complained that there was no real investigation. In fact, the Synod, as we shall see, did not

* Cf. the Imperial Letter read by Peter.

† Cf. Ep. Nest. ad Imper.

‡ Acta Conciliab. adv. Cyrillum.

exhibit the features of a debating club, nor enter upon biblical criticism, but simply gave its judgment, Bishop after Bishop, as to the heterodoxy of Nestorius and the orthodoxy of Cyril, and, which was as important a point as any, as to whether Nestorius had continued teaching his heresy since the papal judgment, so that its provisions remained in force.

We must, in concluding this part of our subject, express our astonishment at the utterly unhistorical position which Dr. Salmon has taken up in regard to another point; and that, too, whilst he is so vigorously opposing the infallibility of the Holy See on the grounds of history. He gives what he considers a convincing proof against the existence of any belief in that doctrine, drawn from the history of these early Councils. He says (the italics are our own).

*The only one of the great controversies in which the Pope really did his part in teaching Christians what to believe, was the Eutychian Controversy. Leo the Great, instead of waiting, as Popes usually do, till the question was settled, published his sentiments at the beginning, and his letter to Flavian was adopted by the Council of Chalcedon. This is what would have always happened if God had really made the Pope the guide to the Church. But this case is quite exceptional, resulting from the accident that Leo was a good theologian, besides being a man of great vigour of character. No similar influence was exercised either by his predecessors or successors.**

It would be impossible to pen a sentence in more flagrant contradiction to the evidence afforded by the history of the Council of Ephesus.

In the letters of the Bishops from all parts of Christendom, which Dr. Salmon will find collected by Labbe, after the Council of Chalcedon, the name of Celestine is of constant occurrence, and always as having been the *κυβερνήτης*, or pilot, in the matter of Nestorius, whilst the Bishops themselves speak of him as "the guardian of the faith" (Act ii.) and the Council, as we shall see in a future article, relies on his letter as the *τύπος* on which it framed its judgment.

Here, then, we leave the various parties concerned—Cyril, in the performance of his duty, presiding over the Council in St. Mary's Church at Ephesus, with some 200 Bishops round him—Nestorius remaining in his own house, prepared to ignore

* Salmon on the Infallibility of the Church, p. 426, 2nd edition.

[No. 2 of Fourth Series.]

the Council—he, as St. Sixtus said, who appealed to it, not appearing—John of Antioch, remaining at an easy distance from Ephesus out of friendship to Nestorius, in whose condemnation he was loth to join—Candidian, the Imperial Commissioner, having left St. Mary's in disgust at the turn that things were taking—and the people of Ephesus, who had inherited an affectionate devotion to the mother of God (who had lived nearly four hundred years ago in their midst, and under whose patronage their Great Church was placed) in a state of the greatest excitement, waiting for her great foe to be condemned—and far away the good Pope lifting up his hands on the mountain, and preparing to send fresh legates to assist the maligned Bishop, to whom the papal sentence had been entrusted.

LUKE RIVINGTON.

[*To be concluded*].



PROTESTANTISM IN ENGLAND.

UNTIL quite recent days Englishmen of all classes have been strangely ignorant of the religious history of their own country. Had this want of knowledge been confined to any one social rank or faith it would not perhaps have been very difficult to interpret, but extending as it has done all around we are compelled to look for some general cause. There can, we imagine, be no doubt that the explanation must be sought in the special characteristics of our insular Protestantism. From the accession of Elizabeth until the restoration of Charles II. there was here, as elsewhere, a struggle between rival sects who agreed in very little else except their hatred of the Catholic Church, but with the Restoration came a kind of unwritten concordat between the opposing forces. Those Protestants who objected to episcopacy received a limited toleration which varied from time to time according to the exigencies of the State. The dissenters were not ungrateful for the favours grudgingly shown them; they welcomed William III. gladly, and many of them, though Separatists themselves, seem to have seen no harm in members of their congregations frequenting the services of ministers of the Established Church. A long catalogue of these "liberal minded" persons might easily be compiled. It may be sufficient to mention Richard Baxter, Philip Henry, the father of the well-known commentator on Holy Scripture, and Ralph Thoresby, the Yorkshire antiquary. The members of the Society of Friends were, as far as we are aware, the only organised body among the Protestants which was unwilling to come to a friendly understanding with the State Church. As is well known, a charge of Popery was hurled at the early Quakers, as much probably on account of their antagonism to the established religion as for that strange mysticism, which to the minds of people thoroughly ignorant of Catholic doctrine, seemed to present a certain surface likeness to some things which they had come upon in Catholic books of devotion.

The religious fervour of the people, which had burnt so fiercely in the reign of Charles I., gradually cooled down. The Restoration brought with it French manners of the worst sort, and when the Stuarts were banished and we came successively under Dutch and German influences, morals did not mend, and religious feeling sank lower and lower. The few exceptions which can be produced are not to be found in the Established Church, or among the historic dissenters, but in the very feeble ranks of the Nonjurors, and those who, while they took the prescribed oaths to the reigning dynasty, were in general sympathy with them. Law, Hickes, Kettlewell, and Bishop Wilson, the author of the "Sacra Privata," are the four leading names which occur to the memory. Of these only the last can with justice be counted to the Church of England.

The rise of Methodism caused a revulsion in English thought which it is very difficult for us to understand. As was natural, the body, if body in the early time it can be called, split into two sects. Those who denied free will followed Whitfield, those who accepted what were called Arminian doctrines adhered to the Wesleys. It would not be easy to trace John Wesley's various and sometimes contradictory ideas to their fountain head. His biographers have tried to do so, but have not been rewarded by much success. He was a great ruler of men, and those who heard him, one and all, affirmed that he was a great preacher. His success, however, seems to have been, at least in a great part, due to the fact that he addressed the poor and the neglected—the men and women who were outside the State organisation, and whose hearts could not be touched by the moral platitudes of men whose ideal of Christian oratory was to be found in the sermons of Tillotson and Smallridge. Wesley held hierarchical opinions which he had derived from the nonjuring friends of his youth, but he never hesitated to fling them on one side when they clashed with what he felt to be of more importance.

Crude and imperfect as were Wesley's notions, even on those subjects wherein his teaching was not contrary to Faith, we cannot be surprised that he shook not only the establishment but the whole frame-work of the religious opinion of

England. It was a new thing in those days to be told that the end of man was not to avoid enthusiasm, but to do the will of God—to save his soul. It was a wonderful portent; to many it came as a new revelation. Though the poor were carried away by it in thousands, its effect was far different on the well-to-do classes. Some of these saw in it a revival of the spirit which had been evoked by the long Parliament, which had for a time overturned the Church and brought the King to the block. To others it was a novel form of "Popery,"—the old religion in a new and vulgar disguise. A prelate of the Anglican communion thought the times so charged with danger that he published a book, pointing out the likeness, which he fancied he had discovered, between Catholic saints such as SS. Francis, Dominic, and Ignatius Loyola on the one hand, and the itinerant preachers on the other.* We need not say that the conclusions arrived at by the author were entirely wrong. He wrote with great bitterness, but possessed no small ability in marshalling evidence, and showed a perverted, but wide, knowledge of Catholic literature, such as we seek for in vain in any other English Protestant writer of his day. He was well aware that if he could induce his readers to follow him in believing that the new sects which were springing up around were in any way like the Catholic Church, he would have struck a blow, from which, in those days of ignorance and prejudice, it would have been very hard for the men of the new religions to have recovered.

Though Methodism had some supporters among the upper classes and the clergy, it addressed itself at first mainly to the poor. Its effect on the Established Church was indirect, but not on that account the less powerful. Two of the three sections into which the Anglican Communion is at present divided may, without doubt, be traced to the preaching of the Wesleys and Whitfield. As to the body known as Evangelical we are not aware that anyone has denied this parentage. As to the modern High Church or Ritualist party the case may

* George Lavington, Bishop of Exeter, 1747-1762. His "Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared" was published in 1749. A new edition with a grotesque preface was edited by Rev. Richard Polwhele, the Devonshire Historian, in 1820. It was reprinted once more in 1833. A short account of Lavington may be found in Rev. George Oliver's "Lives of the Bishops of Exeter" (p. 163).

be more doubtful, but there is ample evidence in the writings of the earlier "Tractarians" to show that they were in their origin an offshoot from the Evangelical body.

We have traced in as few words as may be, the career of Protestantism in this country for the sake of shewing how it has happened that religious history has for most persons remained a blank. From the accession of Elizabeth to the Restoration, Protestantism, in all its forms, was so mixed up with politics, that the political aspect of things has overshadowed all others. From 1660 down to the time of the Oxford Movement, the religious changes in the country, though at times profound, were never rapid or violent, and so observers were for the most part concerned with more noisy matters. The great wars with France, with our own colonies in America, with the forces disengaged by the Revolution, and with barbarism in our colonies and dependencies all the world over, and the great scientific discoveries which are believed to have added so much to our material well-being, have left the practical English mind little desire to study the fluctuations of opinion on subjects which many regard as of little importance so long as great moral principles are believed to be safe.

There are many reasons why it is important for the well-instructed Catholic to know the history of those forms of belief outside the Church, with which he comes in daily contact. The modern habit of levelling down has produced a certain uniformity in our own time which we look for in vain in earlier days. The Protestantism of England as of other lands was for the first hundred years of its life fierce and angular. We moderns are in the habit of thinking of all except the Laudian High Churchmen as Puritans, and making little distinction between one kind and another. To confound the Presbyterian with the Independent in their early days is about as great an error as it would be for the zoologists to confuse the zebra and the quagga, or the ox and the buffalo. Their remote origin may have been the same, but their after-growth was widely different.

When Elizabeth abolished the Catholic faith in this country, as far as it was in the power of human laws to do so, her desire, and that of her astute ministers, was that the

whole population should become members of the State Church. To carry out this idea much wariness was called for. A great part of the people were Catholic in heart and feeling, though but a comparatively small remnant were willing to sacrifice everything for the Faith. It was therefore necessary to make the changes at first seem as little violent as possible. Such a compromise however could not last long. The bishoprics and deaneries had to be filled with men who were adherents of the new order of things—that is, with Calvinists—and there cannot be much doubt that in many dioceses fierce “reforms” were carried out such as would, had she been aware of them, have been not a little displeasing to the Queen. Not content with desecration and pillage, the objects which Catholics were accustomed to treat with reverence were abused with a contumely which reminds us of the acts of the French Infidels at the end of the last century. Not only were the altars removed but their slabs put to the vilest uses, made into troughs for cattle, bridges, and fire-backs. Sanctus bells were hung round the necks of cattle, and vestments made into coats for players. The ashes of the dead were not spared. William Whittyngham, the Dean of Durham, violated the graves of the Priors in the Cathedral Church of their coffins—

He caused some of them to be plucked up, and appointed them to be used as troughs for horses to drink in, or hogs to feed in. . . . Within the said Abbey-Church of Durham were two holy-water stones of fine marble, very artificially made and engraven, and bossed with hollow bosses, upon the outer sides of the stones, very curiously wrought. . . . Both of these were taken away by this unworthy Dean Whittyngham, and carried into his kitchen, and employed to profane uses by his servants steeping their beef and salt fish in them.*

It would not be difficult, even without quoting Catholic authorities, to give instances of brutalities of this kind from nearly every diocese in the Kingdom. We believe, however, that they were more atrocious and more frequent in the Northern counties than elsewhere. These violations of the dearest feelings of a people, still for the most part Catholic at heart, had no doubt not a little influence in predisposing them to join in the ill-planned and unfortunate “Rising in the North.”

*Anthony Wood “Athenæ Oxonienses” Ed. 1721. vol. 1. col. 195.

During the reign of Elizabeth the Church of England may be regarded as a Calvinistic body under episcopal government. We cannot enter into the fruitless discussion as to the meaning of the Seventeenth article which treats "of Predestination and Election." It is so vaguely worded, and the terms used are so intentionally indefinite as to render it capable of nearly any interpretation. There cannot, however, be a doubt that in the latter half of the sixteenth century it was understood to teach Genevan doctrine. That Calvin, though we believe he never set foot in the island, was regarded as in some sort a father of the English Church seems evident from certain singular proceedings taken by the Parliament of 1628 against Richard Burgess, Vicar of Witney, in Oxfordshire, one of the articles of complaint against him being that "he had abused Mr. Calvin with much derision, and in many reproachful words."* This was evidently regarded as a great offence, though the words seem to have been uttered in his own home, not during his public ministrations.

When we speak of Elizabeth's Church as Calvinistic, we must not be understood to maintain that those who rejected the Genevan doctrines were cut off from membership. The few who did so were tolerated; for the wish of those who ruled was, if possible, to cause the State Church to include every person in the realm. With the accession of James there came a great change. In England, since Protestantism had been established, the Church had been the docile slave of the State. In Scotland the Kirk had become a co-ordinate power, at times even more potent in its action than the State itself. James had been brought up and grown to manhood surrounded by these conditions. His theological opinions were those of his teachers. He had maintained that the Papacy was Anti-Christian, and, being an expert in matters of controversy, seems to have been in full accord with the Scottish teaching; but he hated, not unnaturally, the form of Church government to which he had been subjected. When he became King of England he entered, as it were, a new world. The founders of the English Church had begun by maintaining a doctrine as to the "divine right" of kings, which was not only contrary to

**Archæologia*, vol. xlii., p. 5.

the teachings of almost all the greater theologians of past times, but absolutely subversive of civil freedom. How far this opinion was entertained by the Elizabethan divines it would not be easy to make out without a long investigation devoted to this particular subject. James had, however, not been long seated on his English throne ere these opinions became prevalent, and marked out their teachers for the royal favours. It was hardly possible for the more extreme maintainers of the doctrine of "divine right" to cling at the same time to the popular Calvinism. So a high-church school of thought arose, formed out of those who were revolted by Genevan dogmatism, and whose imaginative instincts led them to crave for ceremonial in religious worship, on the one hand, and on the other those who had brought themselves to believe in the Cranmerian doctrine of the "divine right" of kings. It does not by any means follow that these latter were in all cases impostors—men teaching falsehoods in the hope of winning favour at court. It is not unlikely that some of them, feeling the want of a central authority, and knowing themselves to be cut off alike from the Church and the Holy See, should in sheer despair have taken up with the belief, which amounted in practice to the infallibility of the reigning monarch. A volume might be composed of their wild utterances. We shall content ourselves with quoting a passage from Archbishop Laud, who was by far the greatest intellect of the high-church party.

The king (he said in a sermon preached before Charles I.) is God's immediate lieutenant upon earth, and therefore one and the same action is God's by ordinance and the king's by execution, and the power which resides in the king is not an assuming to himself, nor any gift from the people, but God's power as well in as over him.*

In reading a passage like this we cannot help pausing to consider what Saint Thomas, or our own great martyr of Canterbury, would have thought of it. Yet it was this pernicious folly as far as the poles asunder from authentic Catholic teaching, which the seventeenth century Puritans meant when they denounced the "Popery" of the court preachers. Cromwell's first recorded speech in Parliament was made in 1629 to denounce a sermon of a certain Dr. Alabaster, who, he

*Laud's "Seven Sermons" (Lib. of Anglo-Catholic Theology), vol. iv., p. 94.

had been told, had preached "flat Popery at Paul's Cross," and who had been, it seems, commended by Dr. Neale, his Bishop, for so doing.* We do not know that this discourse has been preserved. It probably, however, exists somewhere in the wilderness of Caroline pamphlet literature. We may, however, be pretty sure that what the preacher taught was by no means of a Catholic nature, but some wild nonsense or other about the authority of the King over the Christian conscience.

In judging of our forefathers during the time of the great Civil War and the events which led up to it, we must ever bear in mind that they were not in the same position as their Elizabethan forefathers: these latter had known by experience or by immediate family tradition what were the authentic teachings of the Church of God. In the reign of Charles I. three generations had passed away. The grandchildren of the Apostates were in almost every way a great improvement on their predecessors. They had not traded away their faith for a comfortable life under the Tudor tyrant, but had, on the contrary, in many cases honestly tried to construct for themselves a workable religion out of the ruins of things old and the new lights that had come from Switzerland and Germany. That these amateur religions were not only untrue, but contradicted each other, may be taken for granted without proof, but they seem to have had an effect not entirely unwholesome on the conduct of those who professed them. There were very few, if any, of the Elizabethan political worthies who were men of untainted lives. There is hardly one of them who, putting on one side things relating to faith, can be contemplated with pleasure. When, however, we arrive at the reign of Charles I., we are in company with a far different class of actors. Eighty-four years had passed by, when the civil war broke out, since the accession of Anne Boleyn's daughter. During the whole of this period (three generations we may say) every means that perverse ingenuity could employ had been used to render the Church of God hateful in the eyes of men.

In those days intelligence spread very slowly; there were

* Carlyle's "Ol. Cromwell's Letters and Speeches," 1857, vol. 1, p. 50.

no newspapers—they were the creation of the civil contest. Catholic books could not be printed in England except by incurring extreme risk, and there was little less danger incurred by those who brought over the issues of the presses of Douai, Reims, Rouen and Antwerp. We know well that in every part of the land there were families of all ranks which clung to the faith with heroic devotion, and that in some parts of the country they were very numerous, but in the seventeenth century they were everywhere (unless perhaps certain districts of Yorkshire and Lancashire be exceptions) outnumbered by Protestants. When men or women once conformed they were cut off from the stream of Catholic life and Catholic knowledge. They were compelled to be regular in their attendance at the parish churches, where they and their children would listen to harangues compared with which the deliverances of the most extreme of modern Orangemen are tame. The whole of the literature they would read, with singularly few exceptions, was saturated with anti-Catholic ideas. Plays then held much the same place in the popular regard as novels do now. Except Shakespere there was hardly a dramatist, if, indeed, there was a single one, who had not bespattered the Church and those who served and worshipped at her altars with filth. We have good reason for believing that in those days the Holy Scripture was read much more than it is now, but not only were corrupt translations used, but children from their earliest days were taught that much of it was a divine denunciation of the Pope and of those who submitted to his rule. When the prophets of the old law lifted up their voices against idolatry, children were told of the crucifixes and images of the Blessed Mother of God and the saints that but a century ago adorned the now desolate churches. In the Epistles and the Apocalypse it was easy to quote a multitude of passages which perverse reasoning had shewn to be denunciations of the Vicar of Christ. The version of Scripture which continued to be most popular for private reading was not the present authorised translation of 1611, but the Geneva rendering, which was Calvinistic wherever it was possible to torture the text in favour of that stern superstition and had, moreover, a body of annotations of extreme venom. This book continued to be printed long after James's version was

received into the churches, and Puritans were wont to quote it in their sermons and books. Robert Burton, the author of the "Anatomy of Melancholy," the first edition of which appeared in 1621, commonly used this translation when he cited texts from the bible in English, and we have seen evidence proving that in some parts of the North of England it was employed in the public readings in the churches as late as the time of Queen Anne.*

The secular side of education was by no means neglected. The lives of Saint Dunstan and Saint Thomas of Canterbury were so distorted as to become a standing argument against the religion of which the one was a confessor and the other a martyr, but it was not necessary for the sake of instilling poison to go back to remote times. The days of their grandfathers and even their fathers furnished sufficient evidence. The Spanish power was, in the mind of the ordinary protestant Englishman, so intimately blended with that of the Holy See, that it was impossible to sever them. Every evil deed done by the lieutenants of the Spanish monarch in the Low Countries or in America, every threat launched against our own land from the Armada onward, was unhesitatingly attributed to the direct agency of the Pope. The murders of the Saint Bartholomew, for which Elizabeth and the court ladies put on mourning, were, almost every protestant Englishman believed, an unprovoked attack on a most innocent and inoffensive people, whose only desire was to be permitted to practise in peace the teachings of the Gospel. The brutalities of the reformed, extending over nearly the whole of France, must have been well known to the Queen and her ministers, but the ordinary subject of whatever rank, outside the court circle, unless he had travelled on the continent, was in complete ignorance of these atrocities. We now know that the Gunpowder Plot was the work of a few fanatics driven almost to madness by the cruelties of persecution; we can, moreover, make a shrewd guess, if, indeed, we have not absolute certainty, in what dark schemer's brain the conspiracy was elaborated; but the men of 1642 knew nothing of this. To them it was a matter of absolute certainty that this wicked plot was the design of the

*Bishop Nicholson's *Miscellany Accounts of the Diocese of Carlisle*, pp. 54, 78, 85.

Catholic community. That the King and his ministers knew far better is certain, but it would never have done to spread their knowledge among the people. On the 29th of November, 1605, Richard Bancroft, the Archbishop of Canterbury, issued a circular to his suffragans as to the observance of the fifth of November, in which he attributes the crime not to the Catholic body, but to "certeyne gentlemen recusantes and popish priestes," and then without a scrap of evidence before him for so foul a charge he goes on to say that "the inveterated malice of the Roman brood is not yet asswaged, but that they are very likely still to persever in their mischievous, wicked, desperate, most irreligious and traitorous enterprises."* and each year as the anniversary of the discovery of the Gunpowder Treason came round, the people were bidden to go to their parish churches, there to offer up thanks to God for the delivery of the King and Parliament "by Popish treachery appointed as sheep to the slaughter, in a most barbarous and savage manner beyond the example of former ages."† What wonder is there that those who had been trained in Protestantism, whether they were Royalist or Parliamentarian, Calvinist or Laudian, should have hated the Church of whose features they had been suffered to contemplate nothing but a caricature so grotesquely hideous.

Such was the state of mind among our Protestant forefathers when the storm burst. We are now told by a school of writers, which has been influential in many quarters since the beginning of what is known as the Oxford Movement, that there was a powerful high-church party among the laity. Those who have studied most carefully the enormous pamphlet literature of the time have found few traces of it. We do not deny that there was in many quarters profound loyalty to the Crown, amounting in not a few cases to a chivalrous devotion to the persons of the King and Queen which is very touching, but we believe that we owe the notion

* "Proceedings of Soc. of Antiquaries" II Series, vol. XI. pp. 392, 393.

† The yearly observance of November 5th was provided for by 3 Jac. I., cap 1. A form of prayer, drawn up by the bishops, was issued by the king in 1606. It was revised after the Restoration, and added to on the accession of William III. It will hardly be believed that this service continued in use until 1859. See J. H. Blunt, "Annotated Prayer Book," II., 577.

of the existence of this high-church faction mainly to the dreamers of latter days and the skilful pens of modern romance-writers.

We have not space in which to trace the great split between the Presbyterian and the Independent sections of the Puritan body, which led to such momentous issues. Should we ever do so we trust to be able to show where and to whom is due the ignominy of the bitter persecution under which the English Catholics suffered.

EDWARD PEACOCK.

THEOSOPHY AND ITS EVIDENCES.

I.

"No more difficult work could be proposed, perhaps, to any body of people than the understanding of Theosophy."

WITH this cheerful announcement, one of its latest hierophants undertakes to set before us evidences of the Wisdom-Religion, as its professors, with studied impropriety, have named a system containing no religion and less wisdom. Its compound name is not more inappropriate than its shorter title, "Theosophy." Trusting to etymology, one naturally supposes the word has been coined to convey the idea that the science treats of God and wisdom. But our supposition is very wide of the mark. "The word 'Theosophy,'" one of its exponents remarks, "often leads people wrong at the outset, giving the idea that the Wisdom-Religion postulates a personal Deity. This is not the case.* There is no Theos, no God, in the Theosophical system, and its wisdom is embodied in its philosophy. This is attractively described by the hierophant: "Its philosophy," says this oracular personage, "is more abstruse than that of Hegel, while it is far more subtle; many of its evidences require so much study and self-denial that they will certainly remain hidden from the majority." I am sure the oracular person is right, its "evidences" will certainly remain hidden from the majority, if only from the simple reason that you cannot give intelligible explanations of the shapeless and indefinite. In spite of this certainty, Theosophists are making vigorous efforts to propagate their ideas, and it is from some pamphlets written to popularise their tenets that I have taken the account of Theosophy lightly sketched in this paper, giving the doctrines mainly in the *ipsissima verba* of the writers, with a few comments by way of relieving my own bewilderment.

II.

When it introduces itself by name, I venture to think Theosophy makes a bad beginning. It makes a bad beginning

* "Theosophy and its Evidences," by Annie Besant (p. 5)

because it avowedly fashions for itself a name, which, it elaborately explains, is a misnomer. It starts then by conveying a false impression through the title it selects, and as we dip into theosophical literature we find its subsequent achievements worked out much on the same lines. We are asked to discount the accepted meaning of familiar words, or, while keeping the word, we are asked to shed the environment which made the word intelligible; we are required passively to accept new interpretations which make us stare blankly at our old friends with their new faces, and find no meaning in them. Nor can there be any meaning, until, as Mr. William Q. Judge kindly tells us* "the new meanings are grasped one by one as the student pushes forward the demolition of his preconceived notions." But not everyone cares to demolish his preconceived notions and readjust all his mental furniture at the invitation of unknown Theosophists, and this not unnatural reluctance causes zealous members of the new wisdom to groan over their arduous task in carrying on an effectual propaganda. "The Western intelligence," Mrs. Besant confesses, after sorrowful experience, "cautiously guards itself against unproven assertions."† Unproven assertions constituting the bulk of the "Evidences" for Theosophy, no wonder western shyness in accepting such very meagre intellectual nutriment is classed amongst those preconceived and inconvenient ideas, which, as an indispensable preliminary, we are encouraged to demolish. With this preparatory skirmishing, let me introduce the outline of Theosophical teaching furnished for us by Theosophists themselves.

III.

From an epitome specially written by an American Theosophist for non-theosophical readers, we gather that the theory of nature and of life which Theosophy offers is not one that was at first speculatively laid down, and then proved by adjusting facts and conclusions to fit it; but it is an explanation of existence, cosmic and individual, derived from the knowledge reached by those who have acquired the power

* "Epitome of Theosophical Teaching," by William Q. Judge (p. 4).

† "Theosophy and its Evidences," by Annie Besant (p. 2).

to see beyond the curtain that hides the operations of nature from the ordinary man. Such beings are called Sages. Of late, they have been called Mahatmas; in ancient times they were known as Rishees and Maharishees. Disclaiming all *a priori* reasoning, Theosophy rests upon unknown personalities, whose title of Mahatma is not unfamiliar to our ears. We should like to know something about those strangely named beings, on whose *ipse dixit* we are blandly told we must remodel our ideas of things in general. But our craving for information is only excited, not satisfied. We are put aside with the statement that "in so far as concerns the present development of the human race on this planet, Mahatmas are now to be found in the East." We cannot unearth Mahatmas from the indefinite geographical region thus vaguely indicated. We must content ourselves with listening submissively and gratefully, I suppose, to the fragments of knowledge they have considerably left behind them before retiring into cloudland.

As the result of their looking behind the veil which conceals things from average mortals, they tell us that the Universe is not an aggregation of diverse unities; it is one whole. This unity is denominated "Deity" by Western Philosophers, and Para-Brahm by Hindus Vedantins. That the unity of the universe is denominated Para-Brahm by Hindus, I am willing to accept on Mahatma authority; but when that authority asserts that Western Philosophers with machine like regularity denominate the same as "Deity" I demur; I can hardly admit that Western Philosophers are Pantheists to a man, nor do I think any Mahatma, unless he had his habitat so far east as to be completely out of touch with the West, ought to venture upon an assertion so conspicuously inaccurate.

Para-Brahm may be called the Unmanifested. It contains within itself the potency of every form of manifestation. Hence there is no creation, only evolution. When the time comes, the Unmanifested manifests an objective universe. It manifests an objective universe periodically, and so doing it emanates a First Cause. This First Cause we may call Brahmâ, or Ormuzd, or Osiris, or (with grand indifference to mere words) by any name we please. This is very large-minded and

[No. 2 of Fourth Series.]

liberal, and encourages me to point out that a "First Cause" which is obtained by the action of a *prior* cause can hardly be accurately designated as a "First Cause." Is not a First Cause so named because, having nothing before it, it is absolutely the First? If it emanates from something antecedent to itself, it seems to occupy, not the first, but the second place. It may be, however, that the idea that a First Cause must be first and not second is only another of those preconceived notions which Theosophy condemns, and directs us to demolish. Having thus evolved a First Cause, or Brahman, though our logical ideas get mixed rather in the process, we find that Brahman "projects" its influence into time. As to how this projection is accomplished Theosophists are impressively silent; this projection, however, it explains, is the "Breath of Brahman" and causes all the worlds and the beings on them gradually to appear, and they continue evolving themselves as long as Brahman breathes outwards. But after long oceans of time Brahman begins to breathe inwards, and the universe begins to go into *Pralaya*, or obscuration, until the breath, being fully indrawn, no object remains. The breathing forth is known as *Manvantara*, or the manifestation of the world between two *Manus*, and as the completion of the inspiration brings with it *Pralaya* or Destruction, we have a satisfactory account as to how the "erroneous" doctrines of Creation and Last Judgment come into being. These *Manvantaras* and *Pralaya* have eternally occurred and will continue to take place periodically and for ever, seemingly as if they were recurring decimals on a large scale.

IV.

For the purposes of a *Manvantara*, two eternal principles are postulated:—*Purusha* spirit, and *Prakriti* matter. But *Purusha* is not exactly spirit, and *Prakriti* is not matter, as known to science. *Purusha*, the spirit, goes from Brahman through various forms of matter, beginning in the material world in the lowest form. We are warned that this lowest form is unknown, as yet, to modern science. Every mineral vegetable and animal form imprisons a spark of the Divine and indivisible *Purusha*. These sparks struggle to secure self-

consciousness in the highest form to which they can attain, viz., that of man, and they continue struggling and travailing in pain until they arrive at this form.

This is all exceeding strange and perplexing and suggests various queries. Theosophy starts with affirming that there is no God ; then why speak of sparks of the "Divine." The "Divine" surely has no meaning except in so far as it expresses relation to the Divinity. Take away the Divinity and you eliminate all its actual relations which can be expressed by adjectives. Then, these sparks of the Divine being without self-consciousness, which we are told they are struggling to obtain, must be inferior to man, who is self-conscious. But if inferior to man why call them "Divine?" That appellation has by general consent hitherto been reserved for something that was held to be higher than man, and not applied to something that was groaning and travailing and struggling generally in order to become man. These divine sparks are most puzzling, for we are further told "That the real man is the 'higher self,' being the spark of the Divine before alluded to, it continually partakes of the Divine state, it is always peaceful, unconcerned, blissful and full of absolute knowledge."* Piecing together the knowledge of these "divine sparks" which is communicated to us, we find that they are ever struggling and always peaceful; groaning and travailing and yet unconcerned; imprisoned in an unconscious state in low forms of matter and all the time full of absolute knowledge; unconsciously striving to acquire consciousness and still blissful and continually partaking of the Divine.

One must be a Mahatma, or at least a Maharishee I suppose, really to understand this. It is somewhat comforting then to be told that any one may become a Mahatma. But the evolution of this much favoured being comes about slowly, indeed very slowly, in this fashion.

The divine spark struggling to secure self-consciousness continues to evolve itself. The period, calculated in human time during which the evolution goes on, embraces millions of ages. Each spark of the divine, having millions of ages in which to work out its mission, settles down to its real work

* "Epitome of Theosophical Teaching," by William Q. Judge (p. 6 & 7).

with marked procrastination, and uses up oceans of time in making tentative bad shots. The great work of obtaining self-consciousness may be accomplished during the *Manvantara* in which a divine spark reaches the human form, or it may not.

All depends on the individual's own will and effort. What these efforts are is not clear; but some sparks make up their minds to do them apparently when they have grown tired of doing something else for some millions of years, and so become Mahatmas. Mahatmas or Maharishees are thus evolved during a *Manvantara*, and, after its expiration, become planetary spirits, who guide the course of future worlds. The planetary spirits who guide our globe are those who in previous *Manvantaras* or days of Brahmâ undertook the efforts and became, in the course of long ages, the Mahatmas who have unaccountably selected distant Thibet as a congenial though somewhat secluded residence.

V.

Besides Mahatmas, there are beings known as *Gnanis*,* who belong to other worlds, and descend to this earth from other spheres, in order that they may help on the spiritual progress of this globe. They are not of the race of man, but their presence is very desirable, and true Theosophists should so live that their influence may induce the Gnanis to come again into this world of ours. Many Theosophists. Madame Blavatsky remarks, with some disapproval, do not live in this fashion.

Theosophy also teaches the existence of a universally diffused, highly ethereal medium, called "Astral light."† It is material, not spirit. It is not ether. It has the power of retaining all images; so subtle a power is it that every thought even photographs itself indelibly upon Astral light. This Astral light forms a repository of all past, present, and future events, so that he who can read Astral light images knows all the past, the present, and the future. In this light everything is recorded which goes to make up a man's Karma. Karma is not easy to define, but we may explain it in this

* "Epitome of Theosophical Teaching," by William Q. Judge (p. 8).

† "Epitome of Theosophical Teaching," by William Q. Judge, p. 9.

wise. Every thought, every action of man is not transient, but leaves a permanent impression behind it. These permanent impressions coalesce; they do not die but live on to influence the future existence of the man who has produced them. They are Frankensteins of every man's production, and they relentlessly pursue their creator. The balance, or excess of merit or demerit, affects the subsequent existence of men. So that a man who starts his third or fourth life with an accumulated excess of evil propensities will find his Karma urging him on still more to evil. Not only do individuals unconsciously fashion their own individual Karma, but nations and peoples conjointly build up a national Karma. There is no such thing as chance; Karma settles everything. It is a blind, unintelligent law, acting mechanically with no more mercy than is shown by the winds and waves. Should a man produce a Karma bad enough, he would finally end in *Avitchi*. *Avitchi* is not exactly hell, it is something very unpleasant but we are told "this tenet has never been explained by the masters, who have always* refused to answer and to explain it conclusively."

Space will not permit me to do more than mention the Theosophists belief in two vast but now vanished continents, Lemuria, once situated between Australia and Mozambique, and Atlantis, about which Mr. Ignatius Donelly has discoursed so charmingly. These were the homes of the third and fourth races respectively. Although the Lemurians were only possessed of three senses and the Atlantians of four, the national Karma they evolved with these slender means was so bad that it was found necessary to submerge the whole continent and make a fresh start, by originating a fifth Race with five senses, viz., ourselves.

We shall be superseded one day in our turn, for our earth is but one of seven planets, the other six being, I regret to learn invisible. Of these seven our globe is the fourth which the life-wave visits in its orderly wanderings. For Humanity passes from globe to globe, in a series of rounds, circling about each globe and reincarnating upon it a fixed number of times. All human affairs are subject to cyclic laws, but as the ages

*Epitome of Theosophical Teaching, by William Q. Judge, p. 14.

grow darker the cycles are shorter. Cyclic laws impose restrictions on human progress and the Mahatmas must wait till they can aid the race to ascend. They cannot interfere with Karmic law.

VI.

So far I have been giving a scanty outline of the salient points of Theosophy, and, it may be asked, where are the logical evidences for all this? Putting aside spiritualistic manifestations, I can only answer that I have not found any. I have found a confused blending of various conflicting philosophical systems, the Pantheism of Spinoza and Hegel, the *disjecta membra* of the bad philosophies which go to Oxford when they die, mixed with the metempsychosis of Pythagoras, the fatalism of orientals and the evolutionary theories of westerns, sometimes expressed in language which betrays familiarity with biblical phraseology. Eastern ideas are re-modelled and put before us, draped in Christian garments sitting awkwardly upon them. But evidence clear and cogent that all these things are individually true, and collectively persuade and argue and prove the logical position of Theosophy, of this I have found no evidence. Statements and assertions you may have by the yard; but statements are not proofs and assertions are not evidence. Let me quote some statements meant for evidences.* It is stated that there always has been esoteric teaching. "Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God, but unto those that are without in parables." Yes, but it does not follow that the mystery here alluded to was the peculiar system of Theosophists.

St. Paul "spoke wisdom amongst the perfect." Yes, but how do you prove that the perfect were identical with modern Theosophists. The mediæval alchemists had occult knowledge, perhaps. Paracelsus came back from Tartary a skilful physician; Von Helmont handed on the teaching of Paracelsus, whose *language* might prove misleading, but if we study his *ideas* we shall find he was possessed of true knowledge. What knowledge precisely is *true*? This is statement, not proof; still less is it evidence. For evidence, we find that Theosophists fall back upon the authority of their adepts.

* "Theosophy and its Evidencies," by Annie Besant, p. 14.

"The ultimate authority," says Mrs. Besant, "can be found only on the metaphysical heights, and these heights can be scaled but by the strenuous efforts of the patient and undaunted student. Each such student can bear his testimony to what he has seen and known, but to all, save himself, his evidence remains second-hand. Personally won, it remains a personal possession, priceless to himself, but of varying value to those who hear it from him."

"Evidence," Mrs. Besant goes on to say in her pamphlet on the evidences of Theosophy, "must be congruous with the position which it is sought to demonstrate." Yes, but it must also be congruous with the capacities of those for whom it is adduced *as* evidence, since what may be evidence to a trained intellect may be unintelligible confusion to the untrained. To the mathematician nothing can be more evident than that such an expression as $x^2 \times 6x = 27$ is an affected Quadratic equation, but these symbols would fail to bring kindly light or utter conviction to a mind innocent of Algebra. And so with Theosophy. When you already know the evidence it may be overwhelming, but when you are still in an enquiring stage then, says Mrs. Besant, people "must either suspend their judgment on the conclusion or accept it at second-hand, i.e., on authority. They will be very foolish if they deny the conclusion because the evidence for it is beyond their grasp, but they are perfectly justified in withholding their belief where they cannot understand. The propounder of the proposition may fairly say: 'This is true; I cannot make the proof any easier for you than I have done.'"^{*} This contention is just; we must accept propositions either on evidence or on authority, for there is no middle course. Mrs. Besant admits that evidence is not forthcoming, but what about the authority? Ultimately it is the dicta of those Mahatmas whom but one or two people assert they have seen; the fact of their existence rests entirely upon the unsupported assertion of self-constituted teachers, who have no credentials and furnish no tangible proofs for their assertions. It is mere scattering dust in the air to speak of evidences and then inform us that this evidence is purely subjective, intelligible only to those who can scale metaphysical heights; it is scattering dust in our eyes to lecture us severely for denying conclusions not proven to our

* "Theosophy and its Evidences," by Annie Besant, p. 9.

minds by the second-hand evidence which Theosophy has to offer us—second-hand evidence of confessedly varying value. Speaking for myself, I could not find it enough. To say there is no truth whatever in Theosophy, however, seems to me to be asserting too much. But it is not too much to say that what truth there is is overlaid with the vagaries of oriental fancy and some western inconsistencies to such an extent that the original truth is well-nigh crushed out of existence. That processes of evolution go on is true; but they do not prove Manvantaras; that a man reaps what he sows is true, but this does not prove Karma; that there are other intelligent beings in the universe besides ourselves is true, but this does not prove the existence of Gnanis or Mahatmas, of Rishees or Marishees.

Theosophy, by hiding some things and pushing others to the front, seems to me to be playing to the gallery as when it declares that the Mahatmas will tell nothing about unpleasant Avitehi or hell; it follows the same plan in tacking on some necessary humanitarian sentimentalism about the Brotherhood of Man. The Christian teaching that we are all fashioned by the same Divine hand, and have the same Father in heaven is intelligible to all. For this teaching Theosophy substitutes spluttering and erratic sparks of the Divine world spirit. There may be minds so constructed that they feel the Brotherhood of Man when they are told that every man holds within himself a struggling spark of the Divine. But in the iron laws which fetter men and nations, no less than the inanimate creation by an inexorable Karma, there is no pity, no brotherly love which can avail, no sympathy for the present misery of men who have in former existences witlessly brought their present sorrows on themselves. Mahatmas cannot help us, for they cannot interfere with cyclic laws. Man is powerless to succour his fellow-man, for Karma works mechanically and can no more be resisted than the yielding soil can resist the steam-plough. Moreover, if there is no God and lawgiver, then I do not see where there can be any moral transgression. We may violate physical laws and physical laws will avenge themselves. But that is not morality, for physical laws are neither moral or immoral, but only become moral or the reverse when complied with or

violated with reference to an authority competent to claim obedience. Such an authority has no place in Theosophy ; nor can I find in its teaching any consolation for the poor, the erring, and the fallen. There is no consolation in a philosophy which you cannot understand ; there is no springing hope to be drawn from evidences requiring so much study that they must ever remain unknown to the vast majority of men. There is no stimulus for mankind at large in the thought of the accumulated evils of past existences dogging one's steps with shadow-like fidelity, never to be shaken off till they have worked out their inevitable effects. There is only mysticism which unhealthily stimulates the imagination and vague theories which employ the intellect in barren speculations. Claiming to be old and to show the close bond of sympathy between men, yet Theosophy with all its Mahatma knowledge gained from Astral light, has never built a hospital or founded an order of nursing sisters.

VII.

Let me now take one specimen "marvel" which is appealed to as indisputable evidence. I quote from a document signed by nine witnesses. "On Sunday, October 3rd, at Mr. Hume's house in Simla at a dinner-party, when ten guests, including Madame Blavatsky, were present, Madame Blavatsky asked Mrs. Hume if there was anything she particularly wished for. Mrs. Hume at first hesitated, but in a short time said there was something she particularly would like to have brought to her, namely, a small article of jewellery that she formerly possessed, but had given away to a person who had allowed it to pass out of her possession. Madame Blavatsky then said if she would fix the image of the article in question very definitely on her mind, she, Madame Blavatsky would endeavour to procure it. Mrs. Hume said she vividly remembered the article, and described it as an old-fashioned breast brooch set round with pearls with glass at the front, and the back made to contain hair. She then, on being asked, drew a rough sketch of the brooch. Madame Blavatsky then wrapped up a coin, attached to her watch-chain, in two cigarette papers, put it in her dress and said she hoped the brooch might be obtained in the course of the evening. At the end of dinner she said

to Mrs. Hume that the papers in which the coin had been wrapped was gone. A little later in the drawing-room she said that the brooch would not be brought into the house, but that it must be looked for in the garden, and then as the party went out accompanying her, she said that she had clairvoyantly seen the brooch fall into a star-shaped bed of flowers. Mr. Hume led the way to such a bed in a distant part of the garden. A prolonged and careful search was made with lanterns, and eventually a small paper packet consisting of two cigarette papers was found amongst the leaves by Mrs. Sinnott. This being opened on the spot, was found to contain a brooch exactly corresponding to the previous description, and which Mrs. Hume identified as that which she had originally lost."

I accept the narrative of those present as an accurate description of facts as they witnessed them. But the evidence for theosophy lies not in the fact simply, but in the *explanation* of the facts. Let us first examine them.

(a) Mrs. Hume had lost a brooch. This statement is not quite accurate, for, as Mrs. Hume says, she had *given* it away to a person who had allowed it to pass out of her possession.

Now this statement is important, for the first stage is to prove that the brooch was really lost. The expression "allowed it to pass out of her possession" may be a roundabout way of intimating that the brooch was lost, but it may mean that the brooch was sold, or given away. It would have made the case stronger to have shown that the brooch was really lost, instead of saying vaguely it was allowed to pass out of someone's possession. Evidence should be forthcoming to trace the brooch to its last known owner. Though the brooch had passed out of the possession of Mrs. Hume and her friend there is no evidence that no one else had any knowledge of its whereabouts. This is a point which is passed over, but it is essential. I must also remark, by the way, that if Mrs. Hume "had given the brooch away" she no longer had any right to it. It belonged to someone else. Whoever brought the brooch back to Mrs. Hume seems to have stolen it from the person who presumably had it after Mrs. Hume's friend "allowed it to pass out of her possession."

As a piece of evidence, I submit that the fact of the brooch

being lost to all human ken is assumed, but not proven by anything in the narrative.

(b) Mrs. Blavatsky states that her cigarette papers which contained the coin are gone. We have only her word for it. In cases where we are dealing with preternatural effect I want something more than the unsupported statement of the one person most interested.

(c) In the dark garden they search a flower-bed with lanterns. Nothing would have been easier than for any one of the party to have dropped a small packet into the bed unperceived by the rest. Two cigarette papers of the usual size would not make much of a packet, and walking from the house to the distant flower-bed in the dark would give ample time and opportunity for anyone to extract from her dress a small article without attracting attention. And why was the packet not dropped in the lighted drawing-room?

(d) The strongest point seems to be Mrs. Hume's apparently independent selection of the brooch, when asked by Madame Blavatsky to think of something she would like to have. But was it independent selection? Was there no "suggestion"? No skilfully disguised prompting? We have a right to be sceptical before accepting accounts of preternatural occurrence, and to examine the evidence very narrowly. The only proof given in the narrative is that Madame Blavatsky could not have known anything about the brooch, or Mrs. Hume's desire to have it. I am prepared to give Madame Blavatsky the credit of being no mean adept in the art of "suggestion," by means of which many seemingly inexplicable events have been brought about. I cannot see that it is such a sheer impossibility that some such suggestion may not have taken place, though Mrs. Hume would be quite unconscious of the fact. I do not say that "suggestion" was employed in the case in point, but the fact that it might have been employed waters down the marvellous very considerably.

I am not saying that the whole occurrence was mere trickery, but I do say we have no undeniable proofs that it was not, and that marvellous as it seems to onlookers, it has too many weak points to claim to rank as indisputable evidence. The unexplained is not of necessity proof positive.

I have abstained from making much comment on the evidence furnished perhaps by the semi-spiritualists wonders performed by some Theosophists. The finding of lost brooches in pillows and flower-beds, the dropping of bouquets of roses by invisible hands from the ceiling, are certainly wonders, whether produced simply through a more extensive knowledge of natural laws, or as the work of beings possessed of faculties higher than our own. But their value as evidence is assessed by the system in favour of which they are manifested, and if that system is illogical, no amount of unexplained occurrences will make it logical. Moreover, I cannot understand anyone stating his faith in things present, and his hopes of things hereafter on such theatrical wonders. To my own western mind, the devoted care of the sick, the aged, and the fallen, the gentle virtues of humility and self-forgetfulness actually practised under Christian teaching, appeal with more argumentative force than all the statements made on behalf of that curious mosaic of philosophic uncertainties and Egyptian Hall marvels, decked out with tinsel arrangements of cheap learning which the Theosophical Society puts forth as a rational, a logical, and a persuasive exposition of Theosophy and its Evidences.

W. D. STRAPPINI,

Oxford, January, 1892.

THE IRISH AT NANTES.

II.

THE RIGHT REVEREND CORNELIUS O'KEEFFE, BISHOP OF LIMERICK, 1720-1737.

DOCTOR JOHN O'MOLONY, Bishop of Limerick and Administrator of the Diocese of Killaloe died in Paris, September 3rd, 1702, where he was buried in the chapel of the Irish College, in which still remains the mural marble slab to his memory. The Diocese of Limerick remained vacant for nearly eighteen years, and was governed by vicars during this troubled period. At length the Holy See found it opportune to appoint the Reverend Cornelius O'Keeffe, rector of the Parochial Church of S. Similien, at Nantes, to the charge of that important See. He was a priest of the Diocese of Cork, and a native of "Gleanna-Phrecane"—Glenville. A roll of lineage entered and proved in the College of Arms, London, and accompanied by a deed perfected by Dr. O'Keeffe, founding three burses in the Collège des Lombards, Paris, bears the date, 9th September, 1734. In this the Bishop states that he is of the family of the O'Keeffe's of Fermoy, distinguished by their actions, their alliances, and their estates, which are mentioned by name, that Denis O'Keeffe, father of the Bishop, was turned out of his inheritance of "Dun," now Doon, on the river Bride, by the usurper, Cromwell; that after many hardships he at last settled at Drumkene, in the county of Limerick, where he left six sons, Daniel, Dermot, Philip, Donatus, Luke, and this Cornelius, the Bishop.

Of the highly respectable parentage of the Bishop there can be no doubt. From his mother's side he was descended from the O'Dalys. I have not been able to obtain much information of his early training. Like most of the young aspirants to the ecclesiastical state at that period, the young O'Keeffe likely received at home the elementary training in classics under the difficult circumstances of the time. He was sent to France, and entered the Irish College at Bourges,

when he received the clerical tonsure, as appears from the following document preserved in the Archives of the Evéché at Nantes.

Louis d'Anglure de Bourlement, Archevêque de Bourges, primat d'Aquitaine, a donné la tonsure cléricale à Corneille O'Kiffe, fils naturel et légitime de Denis et Honorée O'Daly, élève du Séminaire des Irlandais à Bourges, dans la chapelle de son palais archiépiscopal, le 29 Mars 1686.

He afterwards went to Toulouse, where he finished his studies and took the degree of Doctor in Divinity (Linehan's "History of Limerick"). In September, 1710, we find him nominated curé of S. Similien at Nantes, where also he held other benefices *sine cura*, and retained these until his death. Doubtless his love for the shrine of "Notre Dame de Miséricorde," which devotion was propagated by an Irish exiled Bishop, and which was situated in the parish, was one reason why he was nominated to this charge. In a "mandement" of one of the Bishops of Nantes about this time, particular stress is laid on the chapel of Our Lady "du Bon Secours," by which name it was also known, in connection with the Irish clergy residing at Nantes. He is mentioned in Linehan's "History of Limerick" as rector of "S. Chronicieu."* He was succeeded at S. Similien by the Rev. Peter Burke, of the diocese of Clonfert, who was also superior of the Irish Seminary at Nantes, which position he held until his death in October, 1724. It is thus recorded in the register of the church of S. Similien, 13 Octobre, 1724:—"Noble V. et D. (venerable et discret) Pierre Burek, recteur de S. Similien, docteur en Theologie, ci-devant, recteur de Pau, chapelain de S. Julien, supérieur de la Maison et communeauté des Messieurs les prêtres Irlandais, d. e. d. après 50 jours de maladie, agé d'environ 48 ans, inhumé au grand cimetière de S. Similien, en présence des Sieurs Thomas Burek, son neveu, Sparks, prêtre, chapelain de S. Julien, G. Stack, prêtre, procureur de la communeauté Irlandaise; Walsh, docteur au Sorbonne, supérieur de la communeauté Irelandaise à Nantes." Dr. O'Keeffe was appointed Bishop of Limerick by Brief, dated March, 1720. The penal laws

*This must be a mistake as there is no such parish or Saint as "Chronicieu" known at Nantes. Formerly S. Similien was called S. Semblin.

were during this period in full force in Ireland. We can imagine the change for the Bishop from his parish and friends at Nantes to Limerick, where a Bishop had not been for eighteen years, and where religion was undergoing a most severe persecution. Limehan's "History of Limerick" gives an account of an accusation brought against him and other Bishops by an unfortunate renegade, who stated "that in August or September, 1729, he was in company with Conor O'Keeffe, popish Bishop of Limerick, Francis Loyd, popish Bishop of Killaloe, and D. Stones, a Franciscan friar of the city of Dublin, at the house of Teigev M'Carthy, *alias Rabah*,* the then popish Bishop of Cork and Cloyne, when the said O'Keeffe and Loyd delivered a letter to the said M'Carthy from Christopher Butler, the popish Archbishop of Cashel, acquainting him that he had received a letter from the Pope's internuncio at Brussels; that the Pope had complied with the request of the Archbishops of Ireland; that his Holiness had sent him an indulgence for ten years, in order to raise a sum of money to be specially applied to restore King James III. to his rights, and put his then Majesty and the Royal Family to the sword" (House of Commons Journal, 1741). On the strength of these informations Dr. M'Carthy's house was searched, and his papers enclosed to the Speaker of the House. Their report, filled with abuse and invectives, contained but one fact, that a sum of £5 had been collected to defeat a measure to prevent Catholics practising as solicitors, and on that fact they urged the severe enforcement of the penal laws. Dr. M'Carthy, "Rabah," of whom mention is made, was the last bishop of the united dioceses of Cork and Cloyne. The present Cathedral of Cork was begun by him. He lived in a wretched lane near it, some twenty years since called "Rawbuck's Lane" now dignified by the name of "Eason's Avenue." I may be permitted, for the sake of preserving the document, and also to show the style of such in those days, to give a dimissorial letter from the Bishop, preserved at Nantes:—

Tadeus dei msrae sedis aptiae graa Corcagiensis et Cluonensis Epüs
dilecto nobis in Xto Eugenio Cunningham, Legitimo Thoro et Catholicis

* So many and numerous were the M'Carthys, they had several distinguishing names. "Rabah" means hospitable.

parentibus orto Baptizato, Vingenti quinque annos Nato ac dictae nræ Corcagiensis in hibernia dioecesios oriundo, salutem in eo qui est omnium salus, ut a quocumque Catholico antistite gratiam et Communione sae Sedis apticae habente quam propter hoc adire malueris primam Tonsuram Clericalem, quatuor Minores ordines, sacros subdiaconatus, diaconatus, et Presbyteratus, ordines recipere valeas non servatis interstitiis per pntes licentiam concedimus sub titulo missionis in hiberniam dummodo per examen idoneus reperiaris. Datum in Loco nr̄i Refugii sub sigillo nr̄o manuali 10 Maji, 1730, Sig. thad corcag et Cluon Ep̄us, et infra de mandato illust ac R̄imi Dmni Epi Rely secret ac sigillatum (Insinué 15 Feb 1730, at the Evêché at Nantes).

Mr. Cunningham received from Mgr. Turpin Crispé, in the Chapel of the Grand Séminaire at Quatuor Tense, 17 February, 1731, tonsure and the four minor orders, and on Saturday before Passion Sunday, in the same place and from the same prelate, sub-deaconship. I may be pardoned another digression to show the difficulties of the Irish students on the continent in those troubled times. The following petition, without date, is among the archives of the Department at Nantes :—

Pax Xpi

Reverendi admodum Domini. Est quod vestris Dominationibus Notum esse Velimus nos infrascriptos in Artium facultate Burdigalensi, nec non natione Hybernos a Patriis aedibus quatuor abhinc annis elapsis propter fidem orthodoxam expulso, jam peractis studiis philosophicis in praedicta Universitate propter paupertatem rerum inopiam Parisios gratia Studendi Sacram Theologiam profecturos, Quapropter vestras Dominationes non vulgariter deprecamur ut Nobis aliquod auxilii ad iter peragendum concedere non dedignantur. In remuneratione cuj Deum Op: Max: Beattissimam Virginem Deipararam pro vestris Dominationibus semper Orabimus.
Humillimi : Addictissimi
vestrum

Servi

Dominationum

Mauritius Rocheus

Donatus Kinnel

Reidis admodum

Gulielmus Flahoneus et

Donis, P:

Cornelius Crowly : Hiberni.

Canonicis Nanitensibus.

There is no date to this document, but it must be about the time I am treating and it shews the difficulties of the Irish students of the period, persecuted at home and living in

poverty abroad. An idea of the state of things at this time may be gathered from the fact that early in Dr. O'Keeffe's Episcopate, a priest, Rev. Timothy Ryan, was hanged in Limerick for the sole crime of his marrying a Catholic to a Protestant. Dr. O'Keeffe set himself to work in restoring discipline, and framed rules which, I believe, are in part still in force in the Diocese of Limerick. He was entrusted by the Holy See with many delicate and difficult questions in other dioceses and regarding differences between religious bodies. From time to time he revisited France, where doubtless the happiest days of his life were spent. In June and April, 1734 and 1735, he performed several ordinations at Nantes for the Bishop of that See, so that he must have more than once visited the land of his adoption,—for he was a naturalised Frenchman. In 1731 on the occasion of a visit to Paris he founded three Burses in the Irish College of that city for students of the name of O'Keeffe, his own relatives. He laid down rules for the regulation of the Burses. The will of the Bishop was the occasion of litigation between Dr. Lacy, his successor in the See of Limerick, and Dr. Walsh, Bishop of Cork, as to which diocese the benefit of the Burses should be applied. It was carried before the courts at Paris, but the cause was left by them without a decision. Dr. O'Keeffe died on the 10th May, 1737, and was buried in S. John's churchyard, in that city, but no monument remains to show his grave.

Having thus given a brief sketch of the life of Dr. O'Keeffe, I now return to my promise in the January number to give the authorisation of the University of Nantes to the request of the Rev. Daniel Byrne, of the Diocese of Dublin, to the Establishment of the Irish Seminary and the rules it laid down in granting the privileges asked for.

(TIMBRE.)

20^e May, 1766. (ETATS DE BRETAGNE.)

Timbre des Archives. Extrait des Registres des deliberations departementales, Nantes, de L'Université de Nantes.

Du Vingt May, mil sept cent soixante-six. Assemblée extraordinaire des Messires de l'université, tenue et convoquée par ordre de Monsieur le Recteur, dans la salle des Révérends pères carmes, on étoient présens.

[No. 2 of Fourth Series.]

s

Monsieur petit des Rochettes, docteur en Theologie, Recteur,

Pour la Theologie :

Messieurs forget, Merlet, et de picamilh

Pour la Médecine :

Messieurs Alexandre, Bonamy, Bodin, Kirwan, Richard

du Plessis, Mailhos, Bureau, Geffray et Sollier,

Pour les Arts :

Messieurs Durif, Le Mercier, et de la Tourette.

Sur la requeste du Sieur Birne superieur de la communauete des pretres irlandois de cette ville Et la communication par lui faite des Lettres Patentees obtenues en faveur de La ditte communauete En l'annee mil sept cent soixante cinq et de l'arrest de la Jour du mois de fevrier dernier, Lesquelles Lettres Patentees portent entroultre dispositions que la philosophie et la theologie pourront etre enseignees á la ditte communauete par des professeurs de la nation Yrlandoise, et que leurs etudiants pourront prendre des degrés dans l'université de Nantes en subissant les examens, et faisant les actes ordinaires, sans qui'il soit neanmoins porté aucune atteinte aux droits de la ditte université à qui le soin et l'inspection des etudes sont specialement confiées par les lois de l'Eglise et de l'estat; l'Université voulant d'un cote procurer aux prêtres irlandois la facillité d'instruire et d'acquerir les connaissances qui puissent les mettre en etat de travailler dans la Ssuitte aux progrès de la religion Catholique dans leur patrie, en laquelle ils sont tenus de retourner aussi tost après leurs études. Et envisageant d'un autre costé qu'on a secauroit trop prevenir pour le bien de la paix et l'avantage des anciens corps. Les difficultés et enterprises préjudiciables que de nouveaux etablissement ne manquent presque jamais d'occasionnes et où le rapport des commissaires nommées par la delibération du vingt deux avril dernier. Le procureur-general a requis qu'on delibera sur le tout.

Sur quoi l'université aient delibéré separament par faculte, et où il le procureur-general en ses conclusions, il a été arreste et enoncée par Monsieur le recteur qu'ecole, que sera etablie dans la communauete des prêtres irlandois située au bas de la fosse paroisse de Saint Nicolas de la ville de Nantes soit reputée et devienne ecole de l'université l'effet qu les etudiants de la ditte ecole tant de philosophie qu de theologie puissent prendre des grades dans la ditte université aux conditions suivantes.

Primo. La ditte ecole tant de philosophie qu de theologie ne sera qu pour les seuls ecclesiastiques venus d'irlande et des autres isles Britaniques en france pour y faire leurs etudes, et demeurans dans la ditte communauete; sans qu'aucuns externes de quelques pays, nom ou qualité qu'ils soient, même irlandois, puissent prendre des lecons dans la ditte ecole.

2º Les deux professeurs de philosophie de la ditte ecole se feront recevoir maistres es arts; et leur mandement de professeurs a la faculte des arts qu le doyen fera assembler a cet effet, indiquant aux dits professeurs le jour et l'heure de la ditte assemblée.

3º Les professeurs de theologie qui ne pourront pas etre plus de deux a la fois seront au moins Bacheliers en theologie avant de commencer le

cours de leurs lecons ; ils seront tenus en outre de prendre le bonnet de docteur en theologie dans la ditte université, au moins dans l'espace de trois années, en soutenant les theses et autres actes qu les Bacheliers ordinaires sont obligés de soutenir, sans que leurs qualités de professeurs puissent les en exempter ; et ils presenteront à la faculté de theologie le mandement qu'ils auront eû de leur Superieur pour professer suivant l'usage des autres professeurs de theologie.

4° Les dits professeurs de philosophie et de theologie commenceront leur cours de lecons a l'ouverture des ecoles^{de} l'université et ils ne les finiront pas avant la cloture des cours académiques de la ditte université. Les dits professeurs donneront aux Sindicis des facultés de philosophie et de theologie à l'ouverture des ecoles les noms de leurs ecoliers.

5° Les dits professeurs de theologie et de philosophie auront soin de faire soutenir chaque année, au moins à quelqu'un de leurs ecoliers des actes et theses publiques en leurs maison et communauté, et ils seront tenus de faire examiner. Et Sindiquer leurs theses, encore bien quelles ne seroient pas destinées a l'impression, scavois les theses de philosophie par le sindic de la faculté des arts et les theses de theologie par le sindic de la faculté de theologie suivant l'usage et l'arrêt de la jour du vingt deux aoust, mil sept cent cinquante neuf ; et leur professeurs ayant de faire soutenir se presenteront devant le recteur de l'université pour qu'il leur prescrive le jour et heure convenable des theses, afin que le dit Sieur Recteur y assiste si bon lui semble conformément audit arrest. Les dits actes et theses s'ils sont imprimés. Le seront pas l'imprimeur de l'université.

6° A chaque primâ mensis d'aoust les dits professeurs de theologie se presenteront a la faculté de theologie suivant l'usage des ses autres professeurs pour lui indiquer les traittes qu'ils se proposeront de donner a leurs ecoliers dans le cours de l'année suivante et la faculté veillera a ce qu'ils enseigneront a leur dits ecoliers les traittes et matières les plus utiles et les plus convenables; et pour ce qui est de la philosophie les professeurs enseigneront a leurs ecoliers les differente parties de la philosophie suivant l'usage dans le cours des deux années.

7° Les dits professeurs en theologie enseigneront a leurs ecoliers *les quatre propositions du clerge de france de mil six cent quatre vingt deux et les leur feront soutenir dans les theses suivant qui les matières le demanderont, et ceux de leurs ecoliers qui voudront prendre des grades en la faculté de theologie seront obligées de soutenir leurs actes pour les dits grades dans la salle ordinaire de la faculté.*

8° Les ecoliers qui apres leurs cours de philosophie voudront se faire recevoir maîtres es arts se presenteront a la faculté des arts, pour être examinés, comme le sont les autres étudiants en philosophie apres quoi ils assisteront a l'inauguration solennelle de la Magdaleine pour y recevoir le bonnet de maître es arts suivant l'usage.

9° En quelque nombre que soient les docteurs Irlandais, anglais, ou ecossais en la faculté de theologie, il n'y aura jamais que les deux professeurs en theologie et exerçant actuellement et reçus docteurs comme il est dit ey dessous a avoir voix et suffrage dans les assemblées et

actes tant de la faculté que de l'université sans qu'ils puissent être suppliées ; et quant aux assemblées de l'université qui seront seulement de cérémonies publiques, les autres docteurs pourront y assister sans pouvoir libérés ayant été reçu gratis.

10^e Les gradués et docteurs irlandais se conformeront on surplus à tous les règlements des université et des facultés c'y devant faits à leur égard, en ce qui ne se trouvera point de contraire aux présentes conditions notamment au sujet du decanat et rectorat.

Il a encore été arrêté et énoncée par Monsieur le Recteur qu'une copie de la présente sera livrée au Sieur Birne et une autre envoyée à Monsieur le procureur-general du parlement, et que les lettres patentes, arrest de la cour et requête dont il s'agit seront enregistrées sur le livre des délibérations pour y avoir recours au besoin. Signé petit des Rochettes Recteur Bonnamy p^r general et Chevillart Greff Secrétaire.

(Signé) CHEVILLART,
Greff Secrétaire.

The 7th article in the Regulation between the University and the Irish College at Nantes is of grave importance, inasmuch as it shows the position of the Irish Church in regard to the rights of the Holy See for some years subsequent, and also the teaching of the National Seminary in reference to it. That the clergy which received its education and much hospitality in France were not influenced by Gallican teaching it would be hard to expect, especially as they promised to receive this doctrine, and perhaps were not sufficiently warned of the opposite. One of the earliest presidents of Maynooth was Dr. O'Byrne, who was Doctor of Sorbonne and Superior of the Irish College at Nantes. It had as its first professors excellent men in other respects; French priests as Anglade and Delahogue. The great body of the Irish clergy were educated in France, and if they could have remained untainted with Gallican ideas it would have been strange indeed.

I will conclude this article by notes from Canon Delorme on this subject regarding Brittany, and the same will hold regarding Ireland, but in a different direction. "At the time Brittany was a province of obedience, and was a duchy subject to the Holy See, the Gallican propositions would have raised protests. But the royal ordinances and decrees of Parliament had so much changed the course of opinion that in the eighteenth century Gallicanism reigned supreme. But once the clergy, which were bound to the State as the first order,

and to whom the princes looked for their chief support, were free, their property confiscated, it returned more closely to union with the universal Church and the Sovereign Pontiff." The same course of reasoning in another way may apply to the Irish Church. Necessity forced it for education abroad. It received grateful welcome and assistance, but especially in France. If Gallican teaching affected the theology of the Irish Church in the eighteenth century, freedom of thought in a right sense—closer relations with the Holy See—has made the Church of Ireland, as well as the Church of France, to lay aside such erroneous opinions, and come in full union with the Christian world regarding the rights of the Holy See.

From the restrictions placed by the University regarding the position of Doctor of Theology in the case of the Irish Seminary, we may gather that it was jealous of the influence and talent of the Irish. From many sources we find that, despite poverty and sufferings, they obtained the highest positions in that country. In a list taken from the publications of the time, we find University Doctors A.D. 1748, Dr. Donnellan, residing *à la fosse*, Chaplain of S. Julien, an hospital near the Irish College, and where many Irish priests from time to time occupied the position of Chaplain. In 1757 we find him *Promotor* of the Diocese of Nantes; also an official of the Diocese. Hardigan, Vicar-General of the Archbishop of Tuam, Mac Hugo, of the Irish College. 1765. M. O'Byrne, Superior of the Irish College. In 1760, M. Salver, Professor of the Irish College. 1766. O'Loughlen, who in 1783 was Archdeacon of Killaloe in Ireland. Shenan (Sheehan ?) Vicaire of Kilfenora, in Ireland. O'Donoghue, Recteur of Birr, in Ireland. O'Connor, Chaplain of the Regiment of "La Maine." Walsh, Doctor of Sorbonne. 1781. Louis Walsh, Vicaire of Ross, in Ireland, who in 1814 was P.P., V.G. Doneraile, Cloyne. 1767 Dr. "Picamith" is mentioned as Professor at the Irish College. Was he an Irishman ? 1777 O'Flynn, Professor of the Irish College. O'Falon, Professor of the Faculty Irish College. 1779 O'Connor, Vicaire of Monzeil, Diocese of Nantes. 1780 John Walsh in Ireland, Vicaire of Conna. 1782 O'Riordan in Ireland. I suspect from other notices he was Michael O'Riordan Diocese of Emly. "Granger" also is mentioned. No notice of his diocese or position. In 1784 is mentioned "un très bel

Hôtel dieu, dit l'hospital pour les malades à Nantes près la Belle Croix—superieure Madame Walsh." Stapleton is also mentioned in 1783, as Professor of the Irish College and Doctor of Divinity with Coyle at Rome. 1787 J. B. Walsh is mentioned as Doctor of Sorbonne, aggregated to that of Nantes, au Chateau de Terrant, Anjou. Stapleton and Coyle are mentioned as in Ireland in 1788. 1789 Shenan (Sheehan ?) is returned as V.G., Kilfenora, Ireland. J. B. Walsh as superior of the Irish College, Paris. Walter Walsh is returned as au Dervatiére près Nantes. In 1792 he is mentioned as in Ireland. At the time of the Revolution the Irish community is represented as follows :

O'Byrne, Patrick James, Superior, doctor of Sorbonne, Vicar General of Armagh,
 Coyle, Priest, Doctor in Theology.
 O'Connor, Priest, Doctor in Theology.
 O'Donoghue, Priest, Doctor in Theology.
 Stapleton, Priest, Doctor in Theology.
 Walsh, Walter.
 Walsh, John Baptiste.
 Walsh, Louis.

The seminary contains from 70 to 80 students.

These details are meagre, but in the dioceses to which they belonged others may supply more information regarding them. Daniel O'Byrne, who obtained so many privileges for the college, died in 1788, and was buried in the cemetery of S. Similien on the 18th December in that year. He was succeeded by J. B. Walsh, who was afterwards transferred to Paris as superior of the Irish College there. It was he who established the "Walsh foundation" in that College. He was succeeded by Dr. Patrick James O'Byrne, a native of Clonfeacle parish, Co. Tyrone, who, born of highly respectable parents about the year 1757, and educated at home in classics, was then, a circumstance not unusual in those days, ordained Priest, and sent to the Irish College, Paris, to complete his studies, on their termination he stood the usual Thesis and received the degree of Doctor of Sorbonne. He was, after the translation of Dr. Walsh to Paris, named president of the Irish College at Nantes. He held other minor appointments, was sometimes chaplain to the

Duke of Angoulême, and received on his appointment an exquisitely embroidered set of vestments. These, with a chalice presented by Mr. Edward O'Byrne, silk merchant, Paris, are in the possession of Dean O'Byrne, V.G.,P.P., Dungannon, grand nephew and successor in his positions in Armagh to his grand uncle Dr. O'Byrne. The chalice bears the inscription:—"Edwardus O'Byrne, Me fieri fecit ano. Di. 1766. P. T. O'Byrne, S.T.P.D.D. Sem: Hib: Nan: Sup^d An. 1790."

Dr. O'Byrne continued to preside over the College until the time of the great Revolution. Though the Irish priests did not mingle with the politics of the day, they were not safe. On August 23rd, 1792, an order of the Department of the Loire Inférieure was made to search the Irish College for Priests who had not taken the Constitutional Oath. 10th September, 1792, on account of complaints made by many "citizens" against "some" Irish Priests for their conduct towards the National Guard, they were forbidden to leave their College or appear in the streets under pain of imprisonment in the Castle or even expulsion from France. Already they were prevented from saying Mass except in their own Chapel. Probably the cause of complaint was that on account of their position as British subjects they supplied to the Faithful of Nantes the place of their deposed pastors who had not taken the oath. April 5th, 1793, we find they were imprisoned in the Carmelite Convent and received permission to embark on board a ship of their own nationality, "The Peggy" bound for Cork. The Irish Priests had no time to lose. The guillotine already had its victims at Nantes, and scarce had the friends of the Irish secured their safe departure by the "Peggy" from Paimboeuf when the horrors broke out at Nantes which are notorious in history.

Dr. O'Byrne was in Paris, and leaving that city in disguise, narrowly escaped, having his cheek grazed by a bullet. In 1807, June 27, he was named third President of Maynooth College, where he remained for three years. He returned to his native Diocese and filled several positions, and in August 19th, 1819, died, having been then Dean, V.G.,P.P. Armagh. The College at Nantes, like the other Irish Colleges in France, except that of Paris, did not survive the great Revolution.

The chapel became a store, and subsequently a cartridge factory. In 1848 the National guard used the courtyard of the College for the purpose of drill. In 1857, Dr. Miley, President of the Irish College, Paris, sold the building for 100,000 francs; M. Dobrée, a wealthy merchant, purchased it and pulled down the building, intending to construct on its site a mansion of the style of the 13th century. It remains unfinished, and is called "les folies Dobrées." Though the College has disappeared the memory of the Irish is still cherished at Nantes, as is shewn by the restorations in the Church of St. Similien and N. D. De Misericorde, and also the visit of the Bishop of that See to Dublin to celebrate the Centenary of O'Connell.

PATRICK HURLEY, P.P.



AN ASPECT OF THE TEMPERANCE QUESTION.*

IN the many discussions of the Temperance Question which recent years have seen, one aspect of the subject has received much less attention than from its importance it was fairly entitled to, viz: the character of the more generally used intoxicants themselves. Doubtless this can be accounted for in various ways. To say anything worth saying required a knowledge more or less technical, and implied an accuracy of statement, foreign to much of what, for convenience, may be called temperance literature. And it must moreover be admitted that information of any value was scanty and difficult to obtain. A result of this state of things was that the crime and insanity, and misery, associated with the drink question were, in a few rhetorical sentences, attributed to the villainous stuff sold by the publican, and this belief found expression through Parliament in the appointment of a Commission in July, 1890, to investigate and report on the whole question. The terms of the reference will best indicate the scope of the inquiry. "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider whether, on grounds of public health, it is desirable that certain classes of spirits, British and foreign, should be kept in hand for a definite period, before they are allowed to pass into consumption." The Commission has published the result of its labours in two blue books replete with information most valuable, not only to the moral reformer, but to the physician, the chemist, and more particularly with reference to Scotland and Ireland, to the economist as well.

Before noticing the reports in detail, a few general observations occur to even a casual reader, the most important being perhaps the provisional and incomplete way in which the question as a whole has remained for so long, and the halting, carefully guarded, one is almost tempted to say, impotent conclusions arrived at by the Commissioners. Science was certainly well represented on the Commission by

* Reports 1 and 2, British and Foreign Spirits, July, 1890, and April, 1891.

such chemists as Sir Henry Roscoe, Sir Lyon Playfair, and Mr. Board, who appears to possess the additional advantage of an acquaintance with the methods actually in use for the production of spirits. And the examination of Dr. Bell and Mr. Samuels, Principals of the Inland Revenue and Customs Laboratories, and of such authorities on dietetics as Drs. Pavy and Lauder-Brunton, probably supplies as much accurate information as can be had in the present state of our knowledge. It should perhaps be stated that what follows has reference more particularly to Scotland and Ireland where whiskey is the national beverage, than to England where beer is the general drink. But in England the quantity of home manufactured spirits consumed is now so great (in the year ended 31st March, 1890, it was 16,853,723 gallons at proof) that the question is only relatively of less importance.

As has been said, in popular discussions on the temperance question, the physical and moral disorders incidental to drunkenness were, more especially in the case of the humbler classes, freely attributed to the character of the intoxicants they habitually used. It was believed that the spirits supplied them were generally very impure, an article only recently manufactured, and largely contaminated with the bye-products of its manufacture—the well-known "fusel oil." Adulteration with noxious drugs was asserted to be by no means uncommon, and occasionally, one heard legends of an article sold in the poorest quarters of large towns, and at fairs and races, into the composition of which not even a trace of ethylie alcohol—the intoxicating principle of all fermented beverages—entered. Violence and insanity found a ready explanation at hand in the supposed maddening effect of this "new" or sophisticated spirit; and in France, where the consumption of spirits in recent years has greatly increased, the Government, owing to the marked increase of insanity in certain districts, found it expedient to appoint a Commission to examine the entire subject, and more particularly with reference to the public health. That Commission appears to have done its work very thoroughly; and broadly, its recommendations may be said to have insisted on the manufacture of a chemically purer product. In Germany the

physiological effects of alcohol have been investigated by Brockhaus; and in Italy, an investigation undertaken some years since at the instance of the Government, by Guareschi and Mosso, into the nature of the ptomaines, has led to results which, as will subsequently appear, have an important bearing on the subject in hand. These ptomaines are bodies formed by the putrefaction of albumen, alkaloids closely akin to strychnine. An instance of their deadly effect will be in the recollection of most readers, in the case of a mother and four children who died near Dublin a few years since, having, it was believed, taken the poison in mussels supposed to have been unfit for human food.

Such, then, being the general state of the question, in Scotland and Ireland, spirit drinking countries, the evil effects of recently distilled spirits were greatly modified, and the noxious ingredients changed into bodies which imparted certain agreeable qualities to the spirits, by keeping the latter in warehouse for periods, varying from one to seven or eight years. The similar practice of allowing wine to mature by age, has, as shown by Sir Lyon Playfair in his examination of Dr. Brunton, the verdict of high antiquity in its favour. "Has it not been the experience of mankind as recorded in the Bible and other places that old and new wine have a different result?" "Certainly, we find it noted in the Acts of the Apostles that men were said to be 'full of new wine,' indicating that the new wine seemed to have a more exciting action than the old." "And, again, I think if you go to Saint Luke, 'No man having drunk old wine straightway desireth new, for he saith the old is better?'" "Yes." "So that the experience of ages has been that old and mellowed drinks are better than the new ones?" "Certainly so." From time to time efforts were made in Parliament to obtain a provision in the law making it compulsory on spirit dealers to keep all spirits in warehouse for at least one year, and in Canada such an enactment is at present in force. In view of these facts it was something of a surprise to be informed by Dr. Bell (first report) that the only effect of ageing was rendering spirits more mellow and agreeable; that as far as fusel oil, the supposed deleterious ingredient, was concerned, it practically remained unchanged after years; that though changes

resulting in the formation of certain agreeable ethers took place, the nature of these changes was a matter of opinion and conjecture only. There were in fact no ascertained scientific data in support of such opinion.

About 1832 a method of distillation was invented, which produced a spirit free from the impurities which invariably accompanied the product of the older method employed in Scotland and Ireland; but this spirit though chemically pure is insipid and flavourless, and does not improve with age. Whether as a stimulant one took this new spirit or matured whiskey was, according to Dr. Bell, entirely a matter of taste. The former had *per se* no injurious effects. The evidence of the next witness, Mr. Samuels, which may be described as having a certain physiological value, involving as it did experiments on himself, appears to conflict with Dr. Bell's conclusions; for he states that this new spirit when used as a beverage produced marked dyspepsia, whereas no such effect followed from old whiskey, even when fusel oil had been added to it in small quantities. The value of these experiments is, however, discounted by Dr. Brunton, who thus negatively, so far supports the views of the first witness.

How, then, is this discrepancy between popular belief sanctioned by antiquity, and founded as it must be on general observation, to be reconciled with the scientific interpretation of the same facts? The explanation is furnished by the further evidence of Dr. Bell (second report), and that of Drs. Pavy and Lauder-Brunton. It is in fact no other than the confusion, arising from the equivocal use of the term "fusel oil." This "fusel oil" is a bye-product of the manufacture of spirits, and consists chiefly of a mixture of the higher alcohols of the same series as ethylic alcohol, the intoxicating principle of all fermented beverages; the particular higher alcohol in excess being determined by the materials used in the manufacture. Thus, the fusel oil of brandy made from wine, whiskey made from malt and from potatoes, will consist mainly of amylic alcohol, but with a considerable proportion of propylic alcohol in the first case. Now, although it has been shown by the French chemists, Beaumetz and Audijé, that these higher alcohols possess a greater toxic effect than ordinary (ethylic) alcohol, there is

general agreement that the quantity of the former present in ordinary spirits is so small that, taken in water by themselves, they produce no evil effects, and, consequently, if, as appears to have been taken for granted in the early part of the inquiry, "fusel oil" be regarded as consisting of those higher alcohols only, no adequate reason is found for the injurious effects of new spirits. As the inquiry proceeds it appears that "fusel oil" must be regarded as a more complex product than a simple mixture of the higher alcohols. The presence of bodies known as furfor-alcohol and furfurol, probably derived from the husk of the grain, is shown, and of the latter Dr. Brunton states his belief that it may cause a form of actual madness. "The dogs employed by Curel in his experiments were evidently for the time being mad." "He uses the word 'rabid' in describing the effects produced upon the dogs."

Reference has been already made to an investigation by Italian chemists into the nature of the ptomaines. It was found in these researches a difficult matter to obtain a spirit free from alkaloids, or at least from bodies giving the reaction of alkaloids, a result probably due to the putrefaction of a small portion of albumen in the materials from which the spirits had been obtained. This discovery is an exceedingly interesting one, and indicates a line of inquiry, which in all probability will yield very fruitful results. It was noticed in Sweden, in 1849, that spirits made in that year from decayed maize, produced peculiarly bad effects, and Lombroso found that this decayed maize generated an alkaloid closely akin to strychnine, with other bodies of a highly poisonous nature. It has not been proved that these bodies would pass over in distillation, but, as Dr. Brunton says, "the coincidence noticed by Huz between the injurious effects of the spirits drunk in that particular year, and the decayed condition of the grain from which that spirit had been obtained, seems to indicate that there was some connection between this injurious action and bye-products of an unusual nature." The quantity of these bodies present must be, of course, extremely small, but their effects are so great that, as shown by this witness, $\frac{1}{16}$ part of a grain of Hyoscine, a closely related alkaloid, has, when given in medicine produced a sleep lasting for

24 hours. Another suggestive clue to the presence of alkaloids is furnished by the peculiar dryness of the mouth following the abuse, and sometimes even the use in small quantities of spirits and wines. This is so remarkable as to make its explanation by the use of ordinary alcohol very difficult, and what follows is so interesting and ingenious that it will be given in Dr. Brunton's own words.

Now atropine and the other bodies which are allied to it, have got this effect too, that they paralyse the secreting nerves of the salivary glands, and render the mouth so dry that it becomes almost impossible for the patient to swallow. I might perhaps be allowed to point out that potato spirit is sometimes looked upon as being particularly injurious, and the potato, although itself perfectly harmless, belongs to a natural order where these poisons, atropine and its congeners, are specially developed, and some people have an idea that although the tuber of the potato is perfectly healthy to eat, yet the water in which the potato has been boiled is not quite sound; and I believe that in some places they will not give potato water to pigs."

Here, by the way, a curious confirmation of this view is furnished by the French chemists, a confirmation which appears to have escaped Dr. Brunton. In classifying the alcohols obtained from different materials according to their toxic power, in an ascending order, potato spirit occupies the "bad eminence" of being highest: that obtained from wine being lowest, thus suggesting a close genetic connection between the useful article of everyday food, and some deadly members of the order to which it belongs; the potato having in fact, in its raw state what Dr. Johnson would describe as the potentiality of evil. In expanding the meaning of the term "fusel oil" Dr. Bell attributes more particularly to furfor alcohol and furfurol, many of the evil effects of new spirits. As shown by Curel in his experiments on dogs, their chief effect lies in throwing the animal into a cataleptic state. Thus, when furfor-alcohol has been injected into the veins of a dog, the animal becomes frisky and lively and appears to be very happy, but it soon becomes very drunk, falling about on either side, and beating its head against the furniture, a symptom indicating possibly the presence of head-ache. The closely connected furfurol produces different effects, "the animal becoming depressed and furious," and being, as Curel says, "possessed with a kind of sad fury."

Approaching the subject from the popular side, Dr. Brunton supplies some very curious observations, founded on Baily's Book of Sports, and the scientific explanation of those observations. Thus excess of brandy and wine have a tendency to make a man fall upon his side; Irish, and whiskey in general, make him fall forward, and cider and perry make him fall upon his back. This difference in the effects of various stimulants which agrees with what might be produced by definite injury to various parts of the cerebellum, is attributed to the bye-products of the intoxicants used, "thus, when the anterior part of the middle lobe of the cerebellum is injured, the animal tends to fall forward. With injury to the posterior part of the middle lobe of the cerebellum, a tendency to fall backward is observed, and generally the different bye-products in those different classes of spirit tend to act upon particular parts of the nervous system, and to cause in them such changes as to lead to the falling of a man one time on his face, at another on his back, at another upon his side; just as if different parts of his cerebellum had been touched with the knife of an operator."

From the examination of those reports which has been attempted, it is sufficiently clear that, on the whole, popular belief has been right in attributing the terrible attendant effects of intemperance to the character of the drink consumed, more particularly by the humbler classes. It is not correct to place all the evil to the credit of "fusel oil," but it requires only a slight modification of this term so as to include other bye-products of manufacture to find in it an adequate explanation. Want of food of proper quality and quantity is of course a factor in the question, and has, no doubt, an important bearing on the maddening effect of spirits—spirits which may on the whole be chemically pure, but which may easily contain sufficient traces of deadly alkaloid to cause violence and insanity when taken in any but the most moderate quantity. Can, then, nothing be done to lessen the evils of intemperance by supplying a more wholesome beverage? As far as the recommendations of this Commission go, the answer, it is feared, must be in the negative.

One of the most important witnesses assures us that we are only in the commencement of our knowledge of the bye-

products of spirits, though most people who take an interest in these things will probably consider the effects of those products already ascertained sufficiently ghastly.

There is a gleam of hope in the assurance that a taste for older and milder drinks is growing—a result, no doubt, of a higher civilisation—but one can hardly take an optimistic view of the practice, also growing, of supplying an article, blended of new and German spirit in the place of old and matured spirit. This is one result of competition in trade, and the principle of *laissez faire*, a principle which by the way in recent economics has been shorn of much of the veneration with which it was regarded by the older school of political economists. It is reassuring to be informed that of fifty samples of spirits obtained from houses in the poorest parts of large towns, no evidence of adulteration with noxious drugs was found; the spirits were, in fact, a mixture of whiskey and German spirit.

The establishment of standards of purity does not appear to be practicable. Such standards are in use in Switzerland, but depending, as they do, on the quantity of bye-products present in a given sample, the application of the Swiss standard would secure the rejection of what, by common consent, is regarded as a wholesome beverage in these countries. Dealing with the keeping of spirits in bond for a definite period before being allowed to pass into consumption, the Commissioners cannot recommend the enactment of such a provision. They state that, “the testimony was practically unanimous that compulsory bonding would harass trade, and was altogether unnecessary, and that this opinion was given by experts from England, Scotland and Ireland.”

It has been said that for Scotland and Ireland, spirit consuming countries, the evidence given in these reports possesses a special value. For Ireland, where the food supply of a considerable number of the people is so very inadequate, the temptation to supply the want in part by recourse to spirits is a strong one; and there is, moreover, the force of inherited habit and social custom to increase the difficulty of the moral reformer. Further reference to these habits and customs does not fall within the scope of this notice. It is, of course, a very obvious remark that even a superficial

acquaintance with Irish history, and especially that of the last century, supplies in great part, an explanation of their existence. Nor is it intended to suggest that in this respect the Irish people are greater sinners than their neighbours. As a matter of fact, the consumption per head of the population is a half more in Scotland than in Ireland, but the condition of the poorer classes in Ireland renders them more susceptible to the effects of stimulants than their more prosperous neighbours.

Readers of Irish literature will readily remember the part played by the illicit spirit bottle in the narratives of Irish writers; narratives, many of which require little of the novelist's skill to add to their terrible reality. It is to be feared that in many of the outrages in the earlier years of recent troubles, the same devilish agent had no mean part. In the Maamtrasna tragedy, for instance, it was very generally believed amongst men familiar with the west of Ireland that those who had a hand in that dreadful business were literally maddened by illicit spirits.

One can form a fairly correct notion of what whiskey can do amongst the poor and underfed, even when it has been manufactured with care, and from suitable materials. Curci and Strassman's experiments on dogs furnish reliable information of the effects of the impurities of spirits on those animals, and by inference on human beings. What then may not be expected from men who have partaken freely of an article manufactured by a very primitive method, and in all probability from materials of a bad kind—a product from which scarcely any of those impurities have been removed. Judged by ordinary standards these men are practically insane.

Some apology is perhaps necessary for the introduction of material, foreign to a notice, in its nature more or less technical and scientific. But the bearing of this side of the subject on the moral side is close; and it may be fairly assumed that the relation of the question to the interests of a Catholic people, is sufficient to warrant the addition to an article in the DUBLIN REVIEW.

T. B. GRIFFITH.

[No. 2 of *Fourth Series.*]

T

SOME PERSONAL REMINISCENCES OF
CARDINAL MANNING WHEN ARCHDEACON
OF CHICHESTER.

I AM asked to write my personal reminiscences of the late Cardinal Manning in his Anglican days, when Archdeacon of Chichester; as I am one out of few now living whose memory of him goes back to more than 50 years ago.

The first time I remember to have heard his name mentioned was in 1839, when I first went to Oxford. The "Oxford Tracts," and other publications of Newman, Pusey, Keeble, and others of the Catholicising school at Oxford, had been read by my mother and sister from the beginning, and they became what would then have been called very High Church. I did not care about such studies, and went to the University resolved to keep clear of *Tractarianism*, and so I did for my first year. My mother, who was staying at Hastings, had made up her mind to take a house at Chichester, in order to be near the Cathedral, and be able to attend the daily morning and evening choral service. I went over to Chichester to find her a house. When she went there to reside, Archdeacon Manning called on her, and from that time he became an intimate friend, often calling when business of his office brought him into the Cathedral City.

I remember, on the first vacation from Oxford that I spent at Chichester, seeing the Archdeacon for the first time—his grand head, bald even then, his dignified figure in his long white surplice, occupying the Archdeacon's stall in the Cathedral. His face was to me some first dim revelation of the meaning of the *supernatural in man*. I have never forgotten it, I see him as vividly now in my mind's eye as when I first beheld him. I think it was the beginning of reflected thought in my soul. Somehow, by one of those mysterious links of thought which come from God's Providential guidance, I at once connected his face with those of the old Churchmen of Catholic times that I had seen in stained glass windows, and in the portraits of the whole line

of Catholic Bishops painted in long order on the walls of the South Transept of the Cathedral. They began, I think, with S. Richard of Chichester, and ended with the last Catholic Bishop, in the reign of Mary Tudor.

I suppose this, in part, led me for the first time to take some interest in the studies of my mother and sister. I read "Froude's Remains" and Faber's "Foreign Churches and Foreign Peoples." These opened to me an entirely new view of Christianity. Hitherto I had, without reflection, really thought that Catholics were not, properly speaking, Christians. The "Book of Homilies" of the Church of England, containing its most authoritative statements and doctrines, said that, before the Reformation of Christianity in the Protestant countries, the nominally Christian world "for 800 years had been drowned in damnable idolatry." The thirty-nine articles, as they stand in the "Book of Common Prayer," denounce in such terms "the errors of the Church of Rome," which, as there stated, seemed so glaring, that I was led naturally not to think of Roman Catholics as Christians. I supposed that Protestantism was the same as primitive Christianity.

I had indeed some Catholic cousins, and they were living near us. I could not doubt that they were good. I supposed they were better than their creed, that their goodness had kept them from being idolaters, and that some day they would become good Protestants like the rest of us. I knew Thomas à Kempis' "Imitation of Christ," a favourite book of my father's, and that the writer was a Catholic, of course, too good to imbibe the errors of his system. But, in fact, I had never reflected on religious questions or even spoken on them with a Catholic.

When once I had discovered, from reading "Froude" and "Faber," that the Catholic Church was Christian, and was the old Christianity of England, a great reaction took place in my mind, and I reflected a good deal on the matter. I returned to Oxford after the vacation. "Tract 90" was, I think, published about this time by Newman, and this confirmed all the notions that had been growing up in my mind. Newman's Sermons at St. Mary's deepened all my thoughts. Pusey's Sermons and Tracts about Baptism

completed the moral and intellectual revolution—I began to have a notion of sin—of my personal sins.

It happened that I now read a Catholic book, "Milner's End of Controversy," and I saw clearly, for the first time, that the Church of England professed to hold the ancient Catholic doctrine of *Confession* and *Absolution*. It was plainly stated in the "Church Prayer Book," in the "Service of Ordination," and of the "Visitation of the Sick." This was just what I felt in need of; on the other hand, the neglect of what it admits to be a divine institution of such immense importance to the soul, and this for three hundred years by the Church of England, unsettled my faith in its being any part of the Catholic Church. I was on the point of becoming a Catholic.

The vacation came and I returned home, and my mother seeing my state of mind was greatly distressed, and begged me to see Archdeacon Manning.

Well do I remember riding from Chichester over the Sussex Downs, a distance of perhaps eight miles, to pay a visit to the Archdeacon at his Rectory at Lavington. It is a lovely wood-clothed valley or hill-side just under the Downs. I remember the picturesque old country church, early English in character, with the round apse for the altar so common in Sussex churches. My visit made a great impression on me. All seemed, like the Archdeacon himself, to be part of the old Catholic Church which was in England. It woke up in me the hope that, after all, England was a part of the Universal Church—of the Church of St. Augustine, and of the old Fathers and School men, of the great Saints and founders of the Cathedrals and Monasteries.

I could not see how this could be, but I felt that men like Newman and Manning were more likely to be right in staying in the Church of England, and trying to bring back all the old heritage of truth, than I could be in leaving it to join the Church of Rome. When I began to talk with the Archdeacon I felt overawed. I could not put my doubts into any form which could bear his penetrating eye, so we did not go into controversy. He wanted me to go back to Oxford to take my degree, and then become a clergyman. He advised me to seek hard work among the poor and ignorant in some one of our great cities. Dean Hook, and others, more advanced Anglicans,

at the new church of St. Saviour's, Leeds, founded by Dr. Pusey, were, it was said, doing a great work there. What could be better for me than to join them? So I should be "doing the work of God and should know of the doctrine that it was of God." It was good advice, so I felt, and I resolved to ponder it.

Just at this point a visitor arrived, one of name and position in the political world, and a Member of Parliament, so I had no more conversation with the Archdeacon. I dined with him—a very frugal meal, cold boiled beef. I remember it was hard. I remember nothing else.

Seeing he was engaged with his visitor I retired to my room, and I heard them talking in the room below me—the library—until the small hours after midnight. Early the next day I rode back over the hills to my home.

My friends were greatly comforted by my comparatively composed state of mind. I tried to go to confession to a very High Church Cathedral dignitary who, I believed, was of the same advanced school as Newman and Manning, but he was so taken aback by my proposal, evidently the first time any one had proposed to go to confession, that in his perplexity he left the room, I supposed to take advice from his lady-wife. When he came back, he said he really could not undertake to hear my confession without consulting the Archdeacon. So I went away. The vacation over, I returned to Oxford, and, for the first time in my life, I began in earnest, working hard at my studies. In due time I passed my final examination, and took my degree—in order to which I had to take an oath or make a subscription that "the Pope hath no authority in this realm of England." This I felt I could never do again, yet I must do it if I took Orders in the Church of England.

A little before this, Archdeacon Manning came up to preach, in his turn, the University Sermon. I heard him, and the result was that I resolved to go to confession to him.

He was staying at Merton College, of which he had formerly been a Fellow. It was arranged that I should go to him on the next day. He was waiting for me, and taking the keys of the Church we entered that beautiful gem of fourteenth century Gothic. I do not think I had seen it before. I do

not remember to have seen it since, but I well remember the solemn impression of the place in its "dim religious light." When we were alone in the Church, he locked the door, and having put on his surplice he led me to the altar rail, and made me kneel there. He read over me, from the large folio Service Book, the prayer "Renew in him most loving Father whatsoever hath been decayed by the fraud and malice of the devil, or by his own carnal will and frailty, &c." I have never forgotten the deep seriousness of those moments. Then I made my confession, but in a most imperfect manner; he asked me not a question, but I believe I made it with such sincerity and resolve against sin, that I have great hope that, quite independent of the words of absolution, God gave me the grace of true contrition.

So far as I can remember, I think the Archdeacon advised me, then or soon after, to accept a kind offer I had received from Newman to go and stay with him at Littlemore, and prepare for Ordination. This he certainly would not have done, had he not thought it was the last chance left of keeping me in the Church of England; for he and Newman were not in each other's confidence, and Tract 90, which was an attempt of Newman to reconcile the 39 Articles with the Council of Trent, had amazed and shocked him much. He thought it likely to send some at least to Rome, if it retained many, as Newman hoped, in the Church of England. About a year after this I became a Catholic, in August, 1843. That time at Oxford was the last I saw of Archdeacon Manning; we did not meet again until I greeted him in London about seven years afterwards, when he had just made his submission to the Catholic Church and was staying in South Audley Street.

At the time I knew him at Chichester, Lavington, and Oxford, he had no shadow of doubt that the Church of England was a part of the Catholic Church.

Strange to say, he never seems to have doubted it until the memorable *Gorham case*; in which it was decided by the Law Courts that, in the Church of England as by Law Established, it was open to any Clergyman to teach that Baptism is a Sacrament of divine institution by which original and actual sin is remitted, and the soul becomes a living

"Temple of God;" or on the other hand, to teach that no supernatural grace is given in Baptism.

The decision, it seems, opened the eyes of Manning, and of many others, to the fact that the Church of England, for it acquiesced in the decision, was no part of the Church at all, but was simply an institution founded *de novo* out of the ruins of the old Church that had been destroyed by the Tudor Sovereigns, when the mass of the clergy and people left the Roman obedience and accepted the "Royal Supremacy."

With the Ex-Archdeacon went out into Catholic Communion many whose names are well known, and many more, unknown in fame. Among the former were Hope Scott, Belasis, Archdeacon Wilberforce and his brother Henry; Lady Georgiana Fullerton, Lady Lothian, Lady Herbert of Lea, and others of some note.

The Cardinal used to say "the *Gorham case* was a revelation to us; we saw clearly for the first time that the Church of England was a human institution; that when we separated in the sixteenth century from the Holy See we left the Church."

In connection with this there was another saying of Manning's, for ever memorable. Some who were convinced that the existing status of the Church of England, under the servitude of the State, was intolerable, proposed secession from the State Church, and the starting of a Free Church of England, as Scotch Presbyterians had lately done. "No," said Manning, "three hundred years ago we left a good ship for a boat, I am not going to leave the boat for a tub."

He lost no time in carrying out his determination, and, in 1851, he made his submission to the Catholic Church.

Until he actually took this step I do not think that Newman, and those that went with him in 1845 into Catholic communion, believed that the Archdeacon would ever become a Catholic. It was thought for certain, while I was with Newman at Littlemore, that he meant to remain an Anglican, that he would become a bishop, and, in fact, that he had a great career before him in the Church of England. No one was more opposed than he to secessions to the Roman communion. When I was received into the Catholic Church he told my mother, "I would rather follow a friend to the grave than hear

he had taken such a step." He meant it, and felt it his duty to say it, for he did not like to say harsh things.

My mother followed me into the Church after two years, my sister after seven; she lived and died a Franciscan Nun under Archbishop Manning's direction. My mother had begun to doubt the position of the Anglican Church. A short time before she became a Catholic, Archdeacon Manning was calling on her at Chichester. She ventured to say, "But, Mr. Archdeacon, are you quite sure of the validity of Anglican Orders?" His answer was astonishingly curt and decided—"Am I sure of the existence of God?" adding "You are a good deal too like your dear son."

These things show how far he was, six or seven years before his submission, from thinking it possible that he could ever leave the Church of England. It may seem strange to some, especially to some Anglicans, how, from feeling so certain of Anglican Orders, on becoming a Catholic, he took the opposite opinion as to their validity.

I think the answer is,—when he was an Anglican he believed that the Anglican was an integral part of the Catholic Church. Sacraments which depend on the Sacrament of Order are a Divine Institution in the Church of God; we cannot therefore doubt that, since God is true, His providence would not permit the loss of Sacraments in any large part of the Church for centuries, and this without knowledge of the fact. When he was convinced that the Church of England was no part of the Catholic Church this argument for the validity of Anglican Orders vanished from his mind, and the grave doubts as to the various facts of history, which are the technical proof offered for the validity of Anglican Orders, lost all cogency and interest. He felt it was not *the question*. The question on which all turned was the divine institution of the Papal chair—the Church essentially visible, one, and indivisible. Anglican Orders, valid or invalid, could neither make nor mar. If Anglican Orders were as certainly valid as Greek, the Church of England would still be a schism from Catholic unity.

I should be trenching on the province of another writer if I attempted to continue my personal recollections of the late

Archdeacon, now Father Manning—a priest of the diocese of Westminster.

He was returning to Rome to continue his studies. I had been ordered to Rome on account of my health, to spend the winter there, and I had the pleasure of being his companion on the journey. We went by Paris to Marseilles, and thence by steamboat, by Genoa, Leghorn, Civita Vecchia, and by the carriage to Rome. We arrived there for the 4th of November, S. Charles'-Day, 1853. It was the hottest weather I ever remember. He went to reside at the *Accademia Ecclesiastica* in the Piazza della Minerva, and I to take up my abode with the Procurator-General of my Order. We often had walks together.

On our return to London in the following spring he induced Cardinal Wiseman to entrust to me the founding of a new mission at Kingsland, a middle-class suburb in the north of London. Not long after, on the death of Cardinal Wiseman, he became my Archbishop. Twenty years later he placed me and the other Father of Charity in charge of St. Etheldreda's, Holborn, in the midst of London labour and the London poor. His words to us when he came to inaugurate our new establishment were: "I wanted you to come here because I wished you to launch out into the deep and let down your nets for a draft." I have had the invaluable blessing of his friendship and guidance for fifty years. Such bonds are not snapped without a sore wrench.

May his spirit be with me still, and may we meet once more and for ever in the Eternal Blessedness.

WILLIAM LOCKHART.



EPISODES IN THE LIFE OF CARDINAL MANNING IN HIS ANGLICAN DAYS.

IT has often been said of Cardinal Manning, that his Anglican days is to him a page in his life finished and turned down. It may, indeed, be a closed book, as far as his public action or speech is concerned, to the outside world ; but to himself his early life with its hopes and disappointments, its struggles and sufferings, and its hand-fought victory is a page on which his memory ever lingered with a half-sad pleasure. The friends of his youth, his co-partners in hope, his fellow-workers in a cause he held sacred, were unto the last dear to his memory.

Yet dearer by far to his heart were those, of whom since he became Catholic, he rarely or ever spoke—his own kith and kin : brothers and sisters. With one exception,* they all remained where he had left them—in the church of their baptism. “ My dear brother Frederick,” the Cardinal once said to me, “ is like a Spanish hildago in his high sense of honour and in his loyalty and allegiance to the church of his baptism. He looked upon my leaving the Church of England as an act of disloyalty which he never forgave. Since that day we have never met; no letter has ever passed between us.” The Cardinal spoke of his brother with great affection and respect. He added, “ I saw him twice; once at a railway station; once in my carriage I passed him in the street.” On his death his brother bequeathed to the Cardinal some family heirlooms and books. “ But what I treasure most,” said the Cardinal, pointing to a book-shelf, “ are those two volumes in which my brother bound up all my letters to him. It shows, that though we never met, his affection for me still survived.” His brothers and sisters held aloof from him for the most

* His elder brother, the late Mr. Charles John Manning, of Pendell Court, Surrey, was received into the Church on the 7th of April, 1852, by Monsignor Talbot at the Trinità de Monti, Rome. His wife, Mrs. Charles Manning, was received on the day of the Cardinal's Ordination in 1851; and soon afterwards the sons and daughters, one of whom was Monsignor Manning, founder of St. Charles' College, Bayswater, became Catholics.

part; yet, if estranged from him in religion, their hearts were from first to last knit together in the closest ties of mutual esteem, affection, and love.

To show how fully the Cardinal shared this family affection, I will recite here one passage from a letter to a near relative, written almost on the eve of his departure from out of the Church of England—that time of trial for him and for them who were bound to him by ties of family affection. The letter is dated—

My dearest ———

Lavington, 1850.

. I feel sad at the thought of leaving you all; for my heart holds fast to you; and faster the worse the times are My last letter I fear gave you no comfort. But, dearest ———, I dare not betray the Truth. Give my very affectionate love to ———

H. E. M. *

They, who only knew the Cardinal slightly or superficially, had no conception of the depth and tenderness of his loving nature. No man was more misunderstood in this respect by the bulk of those who venerated him as their Cardinal Archbishop. The numerous and affectionate letters that passed between him and his relatives prove this beyond dispute or doubt. Especially do I wish to emphasize—and it is within my own knowledge—that this affection is not one-sided, but mutual. The following passage from a long letter—I wish I had space to transcribe the whole of it in these pages—will prove the point. It is addressed to a near relative (Anglican). The letter is dated†—

Archbishop's House, Westminster, S.W.,

My dear ———

January 9th, 1882.

. Frederick had kept all my letters to him, and had them put into two bound guard books. Dear brother, I never knew how much he cared for me. Some of his letters are most affecting. Indeed, I have been more touched and surprised than I can say at all your letters and those of my father and mother never for a day have I forgotten them at the Altar in the Holy Mass.

H.E.C.A.

Indeed, it was his brother's great affection for the Cardinal

* Cardinal Manning's Private Letters.

† *Ibid.*

which stood in the way of their meeting. A like cause, coupled, perhaps, with fear of his influence, operated with other members of his family, who, after he became a Catholic, though their love survived to the last, held aloof from him. The sole survivor of a family of nine, of whom the Cardinal was the youngest, confirms this statement in a letter to me, one passage from which I have permission to recite. It is as follows:—

It is *quite true* that there never was the slightest diminution of affection between them. It was Frederick's (my second brother's) great love for the Cardinal that would have made meeting so painful; and my brother's wife fully shared the same feeling. For myself, though fully sharing it, I had not the courage to deprive myself of his loved society, nor did I see the necessity; so by God's mercy our mutual love was cherished to the end, though failing health on both sides precluded of late our meeting.*

Of this brother and sister in particular the Cardinal often spoke in terms of affection. In reference to the members of his own family, as well as to his friends and fellow-workers in the old days, the Cardinal said:—

I left them, not they me. I went over the bridge; they, too many of them, stayed behind. I did not consider it right or proper or comporting with the dignity of the Cause I represent by making advances to subject myself to a rebuff. But I met more than half way those who held out a hand to me. We parted; they held aloof from me; but not one, I verily believe, of my friends in those days of trial bore ill-will against me personally, or even resented my quitting their side. They avoided me because they were in fear of my influence over their hearts and minds. We remained friends, though apart, for a lifetime.

To listen to the venerable Cardinal, reviving with such vivid touches of graphic description the memories of his Anglican days, is to feel persuaded that, whatever may be the case as regards his external relations or life in public, his heart is not divorced from the scenes in which he played a foremost part; from their joys and sorrows; from the labours and trials; triumphs, too, and rewards of half a lifetime.

Hence it was that the Cardinal took a genuine and lively interest in the "Life" which, with his assistance, I wrote in the years 1887-8-9. The First Volume, "Henry Edward

* A meeting was to have taken place just before Christmas, but was postponed owing to the severity of the weather.

Manning in his Anglican Days," was to have been published in his lifetime ; the Second Volume, comprising his Catholic life, was to appear after his death. . In regard to the nature and extent of the Cardinal's assistance, it was to be limited, as understood from the first, to his public life ; to the growth and character of his religious principles ; to his personal relations with his contemporaries ; to the conflicts and controversies of the day ; and to the prolonged struggle, in which he took a leading part, to secure "the independence of the Church as a divine witness to the Faith." Such facts and circumstances within his own knowledge as threw light on contemporary events were placed at my disposal as material to work upon : to be examined with critical care ; to be accepted or rejected, wholly or in part, according to the weight of evidence. Of this liberty I have availed myself to the full. All documents, records, diaries, and letters, in so far as they were connected with events in his life, the Cardinal permitted me to read, to transcribe, or to take notes of. His private Diary, kept whilst he was at Rome during the Revolutionary year 1847-8, which, as the Cardinal told me, had been seen by no eye but his, had never passed out of his hands, was placed in mine, to make what use of I liked. It is most invaluable as throwing light upon his mind at a critical moment, and as recording the impressions which the Catholic system and worship in foreign lands and at Rome produced, especially when contrasted with the Anglican system at home.

It would be out of place in these pages, preliminary in a sense to the "Life" of the Cardinal, to do more than merely record how much I owe to the kind aid of four or five of the Cardinal's still, or but recently, surviving contemporaries. By correspondence or in personal intercourse they made me fully acquainted with the Cardinal's early life at home, at Oxford, at Lavington, or in the larger world in which, later on, he played so prominent a part. In his kindness, and out of his great regard for the Cardinal, Mr. Gladstone gave me invaluable information of Manning in his Anglican days, when he and Mr. Gladstone stood shoulder to shoulder in defence of the Anglican cause.

" You are only just in time," said Mr. Gladstone, five

years ago, "for Manning's contemporaries are dropping off one by one, and all the intimate knowledge I possess of his life in his Anglican days; of his character and influence; of the high opinion entertained of him by some of his greatest contemporaries, had you not undertaken to write his 'Life,' would have died with me unrecorded."

In this manner I have obtained a life-picture which, had I only the power to transfer it, even in part, to paper, would have added a deeper and more intimate knowledge of the earlier life and character of one, whose loss all who knew and loved him deplore to-day from the bottom of their heart.

The publication during his lifetime of the history of his Anglican days was laid aside at the Cardinal's wish. Up to the time of his serious illness in the winter of '88-9 the Cardinal was, I may say, eager for its publication. Afterwards his mind changed on the subject, caused in part, no doubt, by the depression due to his illness; in part, to that nervous apprehension, which was one of the most characteristic elements in the Cardinal's mind, of the results of any work or action appertaining to things Catholic, in which he had not a guiding or controlling hand. Love of power has often been attributed to the Cardinal. "His finger is in every man's pie." And so it was; not from love of power; but from an intense fear that others would make a mess of it. No Catholic movement, ecclesiastical or lay; no work, secular or religious, he was firmly persuaded in his own mind, would be safe or free from blunders or bungling, unless it were in his own hands. Conscious of his own capacity and skill, he mistrusted, perhaps somewhat over much, the capacity or skill of others. Hence, perhaps not unnaturally, the unpopularity, limited indeed to the more active-minded among the clergy and laity, which attached itself to the Cardinal in the earlier days of his ecclesiastical rule.

I am glad indeed to seize, or rather to make an opportunity denied to me elsewhere in the shackles or restraint of space under which I am working, to remove from so great and successful a ruler the reproach of an undue love of power.

Resuming the immediate subject, from which I have purposely made a digression, I have only to add, that after his illness in '89, this natural, inherent nervousness of results revived in the Cardinal in regard to his "Anglican life." On one occasion, in almost a pathetic tone, the Cardinal said: "Don't you think you had better leave what you have to say of me till after I am dead."

I all the more readily acquiesced in the Cardinal's desire, as I had long ago discovered the impossibility of squaring his own theory of his life with the actual facts and circumstances of the case. Hence his decision was a greater relief to my mind even than to the Cardinal's own.

It is as easy to write an eulogy of one so richly endowed by Nature and Grace; with his right hand and his left so full of good works, done in the full glare of the day, or seen only of God; of heart so kindly, so masterful in action as the late Cardinal Manning; as easy as it is difficult to arrive at a just and adequate estimate of a character so complex and at times so contradictory. I cannot separate, even if I would, Manning in his Catholic from Manning in his Anglican days; the Cardinal Archbishop from the Archdeacon of Chichester or the Rector of Lavington. "To speak of me in my Anglican days," said the Cardinal, "is like speaking of Noah before he went into the Ark." I cannot help it. To understand the character of a man aright, it does not suffice—indeed it is utterly misleading—to contemplate only the ripened perfections of a heart and soul chastened, maybe, for His own divine purposes, by the hand of God, and to overlook all the earlier results produced by a mind or will still following the dictates of its own nature. Remembering, therefore, Wordsworth's philosophic saying that the boy is father of the man, we must search for the more hidden sources of character, for the underlying motives that impel to action in the beginnings of life; in the days of lesser perfections, of lesser response, perhaps, to divine Grace, or of open revolt, maybe, of self-will asserting—more especially in a strong or obstinate nature—at any rate for a time, its masterful independence.

We are apt to regard our great men or our good and holy men, our saints or sages, only as we see them to-day, more or less perfected by the action of the will, by the experience

or purifying trials of life, by self-discipline and the grace of God. We are startled, nay offended, at hints of faults or foibles in the past; at suggestions that motives, more or less mixed, dictated their action or determined their course in life, in the beginning or mid-way of their career. In contemplating St. Paul, we forget Saul of Tarsus.

The life of Manning in his Anglican days is the life of Saul of Tarsus: of Noah before he went into the Ark. "In criticising the Archdeacon of Chichester," I once remarked to the Cardinal, "bear in mind, I am only pitching into Noah before he went into the Ark." I could not but perceive that the Cardinal still retained a sneaking kindness for Noah and his antecedents and surroundings before the Deluge. In the view that little or no fault could be fairly imputed to the Archdeacon of Chichester, the Cardinal expounded a theory that reduced his life and the principles which he held as Anglican and Catholic into a harmonious whole.

The Principle of Continuity (said the Cardinal) is the key to the right understanding of my life, of my intellectual developments. It is the nucleus round which everything else grows and gathers. The principles which I hold to-day as a Catholic, I held as an Anglican. My Catholic are but the logical developments of my Anglican principles. In becoming a Catholic I suffered no violent wrench, no break of continuity. It was a progression from the beginning: step by step, slow, but sure; a growth, not a change.

This theory, which the Cardinal reduced to writing five years ago or more, embraces the whole range of his work in life, religious and intellectual, social, political, and philanthropic; though full of interest and eminently characteristic, such a synopsis would be out of place in these pages, out of proportion in a review so brief of a subject so large. It was obviously constructed not only out of love for logical symmetry, but out of a tender regard—it might almost be considered a subtle form of self-love—which the Cardinal felt, especially of late years, for the Archdeacon of Chichester and all his works and ways. Don't let me be misunderstood. It was not sympathy with Anglicanism as such, quite the reverse; but with the Catholic spirit, the Catholic principles, the Catholic doctrines identical with those he held as a Catholic, which, the Cardinal persuaded himself, were held

and taught from the beginning by the Archdeacon of Chichester.

As a witness on his own behalf, if I may so speak, Cardinal Manning has given invaluable aid towards the right understanding of his life: that is to say, from his own point of view. Such testimony is not only in itself singularly interesting, but is entitled to the highest consideration, for it is given not in elucidation of controversies in the past, or of points still under dispute, or of public conduct, but of the principles which had, as he contended, consistently guided and governed his actions as Anglican and Catholic alike, from the beginning to the end of his life. As the star by night and the pillar of smoke by day led the wise men of the East to the cradle at Bethlehem, so, according to the Cardinal's pious opinion, had the Principle of Continuity, the root principle of his life, the *idée mère*, as the French call it, of his character—led his slow but sure steps through the intricate ways and darknesses of life to the threshold of the Apostles. Such evidence as is given in support of this theory is, of course, not in itself conclusive; far from it. There is the evidence of his own acts, of his own writings; his Charges, for instance, as Archdeacon of Chichester; the testimony of his contemporaries—eyewitnesses of the conflicts of the day, or of the fluctuations in his religious opinions—to be considered, if not formally, incidentally in the view of determining, whether the carefully elaborated theory fitted into, or conflicted with, the actual facts and circumstances of his life and conduct.

The Cardinal was unfortunate in his official or officious biographers. I am not speaking so much of recent memoirs, for they were—with a few exceptions of gross inaccuracy and atrocious taste—just, sympathetic, or graceful tributes to the great English Cardinal, whose unique personality—grand and noble in spite of failings and shortcomings, from which not even saints are exempt—attracted in a singular degree the admiration and affection of men of all conditions and creeds. The meagre biographical sketches, which have appeared from time to time, are all stamped with a like defect. They are unreal and lifeless. They present not the picture of a living, breathing man of flesh and blood, but a wooden

[No. 2 of Fourth Series.]

U

ecclesiastical lay-figure tricked out, not only at the end, but in the beginning of his career, by a vulgar fancy with I know not what forms of superhuman excellencies and unnatural perfections. As well impute to St. Augustine, before he was rescued by the prayers of St. Monica, the virtues which later in life were supernaturally added to the Saint. As well ascribe to the heated wrestler, often thrown of his own fault or failing in the life and death struggle with self, the peace and calm tranquillity of soul, only acquired after the triumphant issue of the conflict.

How many stilted eulogies (miscalled biographies) of great men, not to speak of the lives of saints, have not been composed on this false and absurd principle. The dignity of tone and thought, austere self-restraint, wisdom of speech natural to a great man at the end of his career, is imputed to the youth on the threshold of life. The deep insight into human nature displayed in Wordsworth's philosophic saying is reversed for "the man" is made "father of the boy," no room is left to the impulses of youth; no play allowed for the incitements of ambition; self-seeking, worldly wisdom, vain-glory are left out of account. As well put an old head on young shoulders; or give to the man, whose sword is yet unfleshed in the battle of life, the venerable aspect, the "gleaming dome" as Tennyson puts it, and the attenuated frame of the hero of a hundred fights. Such high-flown eulogists even discover the laurel crown on the brow of the boy in his cradle.

Invited to contribute to the pages of this Review, in which his matured thoughts on, grave questions were so often expressed, some characteristic or leading episodes in the life of our great Cardinal, especially in his Anglican days, I cannot more fittingly correspond to the duty laid upon me than by making use of some of the materials which he himself supplied me with. Of infinite value is the Cardinal's Diary in the year 1847-8, revealing incidentally and yet so fully the state of his mind in regard to the Catholic Church in that crucial transition-period in his seventeen-year trial—his long, slow, and painful pilgrimage from Lavington to Rome—the goal and glory of his life. In like manner, of special interest are the Cardinal's private

letters, so kindly placed at my disposal for the purpose of making more widely known or more deeply appreciated, as nothing else could, the loving-kindness of his nature; the warm affections of his heart for those dear friends and relatives whom he left behind on the other side of the bridge. This home-love—how deep and abiding it was on either side their letters show—no change in religious opinion could break; no wrench in habits or mode of life could dissolve or even slacken; nor time nor events, nor life nor death could efface the life-long and after-life love which bound in one his heart and theirs, who were nearest and dearest to him. This tender and touching home-love runs like a golden thread through the web and woof of the Cardinal's life.

On these intimate and inner relations of his life I may say no more; yet, knowing all I do, I could in justice say no less.

In presenting the Cardinal as he was in his Anglican days, I shall run some risk of disappointing, perhaps even of offending, not out of want of reverence or of loving regard, some of those who only knew and venerated him as their beloved Cardinal Archbishop. For they knew him only in the happier days, when his heart and soul had been more completely enlightened by Divine Grace; when his will had been brought into fuller conformity with the Will of God; and his mind enlarged and enriched by the wisdom, which comes of the more perfected knowledge of God, of His Church, and of His dealings with the souls of men.

To watch with sympathy growth in holiness, in wisdom and fear of the Lord is an interesting and instructive lesson. But to impute the perfections and virtues only attained after long searchings of heart and purifying trials to a novice: a godly young clergyman ministering in a Sussex village: a learned and pious Archdeacon struggling with a stubborn self-will as yet unsubdued, deflected, maybe, once and again, from the onward and upward path, is not only to commit an act of sentimental folly, but to ignore the gradual operations of Divine Grace. In the simplicity and sincerity of his nature, the Cardinal would have been the first to resent and repudiate such ill-disguised and mistaken

flattery; the last to take affront at honest and outspoken criticism made in good faith.

To illustrate the gradual growth in wisdom and holiness, the inward struggle of a noble nature against the impulses of self-will, and the shaping of the ways by God's hand, I shall select certain passages or episodes that occur in the beginning, middle, and close of the Cardinal's career as an Anglican. It is not my fault if, in doing so, I have occasionally to traverse the fictions and follies, which in ignorance not only of facts and circumstances, but even of the bent and bias of his mind as an Anglican, have been palmed off as the true and real presentment of Cardinal Manning's early life and character.

In justice to the Cardinal, and out of reverence to his memory, I am constrained, I will not say to stigmatise, but to repudiate in the most emphatic terms sensational tales infinitely worse than the foolish fables just alluded to. Certain statements have been put about, purporting to have emanated from the Cardinal. They are either the results of a grossly inaccurate memory, of a strangely defective ear, or of an utter mental incapacity to catch the drift and meaning of the Cardinal's speech. They, who best knew and understood aright the Cardinal's mind and thought, are at one in regarding all such after-death statements in the same light as those of an eavesdropper. As to the vulgar and vicious taste of rushing into print over an open grave with sensational paragraphs I care not to express my opinion; far less the indignation felt by the Cardinal's relatives and real friends. "Save me from my (self-styled) friends," the Cardinal might well have exclaimed; but I fancy he would rather have said with Diogenes, "I see that even Diogenes nourisheth parasites." The Cardinal knew his fate beforehand, for he recently said in reference to Mr. Gladstone "It is the fate of great men to be attended by parasites."

Neither do I envy the silly ones, though their vice or vanity is of a different kind, who pose to-day at public meetings, wearing, as they fancy or give out in private, if not in public, the dead Cardinal's mantle. It is a easy out of his literary remains—statements, that is to say, picked up in the course of conversation, without their due limitations and qualifications;

hypotheses, perhaps, put forward under certain conditions—to construct a theory of their own on the Temporal Power of the Pope—not his, at all events, in its nakedness, as it is safe, now that the Cardinal is dead, to propound such a theory in public to the delectation of the enemies, home and foreign, of the Papacy.

PEDIGREE OF THE MANNING FAMILY.

There is another string of errors to be set straight which if, unlike the above mis-statements, harmless, yet are confusing in their strange inaccuracy regarding the Cardinal's nearest relatives by blood and marriage. Scarcely a fact or date is exact. If the errors include even the date of the Cardinal's own birth, who can wonder at all the strange myths, circulated concerning the marriage, life, and death of Caroline Sargent, wife of the Rector of Lavington. To clear up all these myths and mis-statements, I cannot do better, perhaps, than transcribe here, in an abridged form, from the Cardinal's pedigree in the "Life," the following dates and facts:—

William Manning, M.P., born 1st December, 1763, died April 17th, 1835; married for first wife Elizabeth, sister of Abel Smith and of Robert, created Lord Carrington, who died in 1789: had issue:

Two daughters, Elizabeth and Mary; Elizabeth died unmarried; Mary was married to General Cary, brother of Sir Peter Cary, of the Guernsey family.

William Manning married, secondly, in 1792, Mary, daughter of Henry Lenoy Hunter, Esq., of Beech Hill, Reading, Berks, born July 4th, 1771, died May 12, 1847; buried at Sunbridge, Kent.

Four sons and three daughters were the issue of the second marriage:

William, born July, 1793, died 1812.

Frederick, of Holly Walk, Leamington, born 1795, died 1880; married Elizabeth Edmunds (always called by the latter name), daughter of Edmund Turnor M.P., F.R.S., and niece of Sir Christopher Turnor, M.P., of Stoke, and Panton House, Rochford.

Anna Maria, born 1796, died 1880; and was married, 4th March, 1816, to John Laviscount Anderdon, Chiselhurst, Kent, who died 1874.

Charles John, born 1799, died 1880; married, 1828, Catherine, daughter of Sir Richard Downes Jackson, K.C.B., some time Commander and Governor of Canada, and colonel of the Coldstream Guards, who died 30th November, 1859; for second wife, 1861, Louisa Henniker, daughter of Sir Edward Henniker.

Caroline, born January 22nd, 1801, was married to Colonel Austen, M.P., of Keppington, Sevenoaks, who died 1859.

Harriet, born January 29th, 1805, died 1823.

Henry Edward, born July 15th, 1807, died 14th January, 1892; married November 7th, 1833, Caroline, daughter of Rev. John Sargent, Rector of Lavington, born 1811, died July 24th, 1837.

EPISODE I.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS FROM LAVINGTON TO ROME. 1832-6.

But Thou, dear Lord,
Whilst I traced out bright scenes which were to come,
Isaac's pure blessings and a verdant home,
Didst spare me and withhold Thy fearful word,
Willing me year by year till I am found
A pilgrim pale with Paul's sad girdle bound.*

In the spring of 1832, acting on the advice of his friends, the Wilberforces, Manning, who had taken his degree, first class in Classics in the Michaelmas term of 1830, came up again to Oxford to qualify for Orders. He was elected Fellow of Merton, but of course resigned his Fellowship on his marriage, and took Orders on the 23rd of December in the same year. His first sermon† was preached on Christmas Day, as the Cardinal told me five or six years ago, at the church at Cuddesdon, where Mr. George Anthony Denison, now Archdeacon, was curate.

The Venerable Archdeacon Denison, in a letter dated February 2nd, 1889, says :—

The Cardinal recalled to me not very long ago his first preaching for me, then curate of Cuddesdon, in dear Bishop Bagot's time, 1832-8. I have no memoranda enabling me to answer your first question put to me about my impressions in regard to the Cardinal in early days of my life—nothing certainly unfavourable. I became acquainted with him at first as an acquaintance only; afterwards we came nearer together in public action. He was an intimate friend of my dear brother Stephen at Oxford. My brother is long since dead.

In regard to his first sermon, the Cardinal writes in a letter‡ dated—

* Newman—*Verses on Various Occasions, lxxviii., Our Future*: “What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter.”

† His first sermon as a Catholic, twenty years after, was preached at a little church in Horseferry Road, then, if not now, in the slums of Westminster.

‡ *Private Letters.*

Archbishop's House,

Westminster, S.W.,

My Dear ——

January 9th, 1882.

. This is the 50th year since I began to preach. Last night I preached on the same words which were my first text on Christmas Day, 1832, Isaiah lx., 1, 2, 3. I hope we may enter into that Light.

The tables show that the 8th of January, 1882, was a Sunday, the Sunday within the octave of the Epiphany, and the sermon was preached at the Italian Church, Hatton Garden.

Manning served for a few months as curate to Mr. Sargent, Rector of Lavington, and had the charge of an outlying hamlet, Upwaltham. On the death of the Rector in May, 1833, from consumption, accelerated by an attack of influenza, which was in that year as prevalent, if not as fatal, as it is to-day, his mother, Mrs. Sargent, daughter and heiress of Richard Bettsworth, and widow of John Sargent, M.P. for Seaford, who died in 1831, presented, as Patron of the Benefice of Lavington, the Living to Manning, as she had presented it 27 years before to her son. The late Rector and his family resided not at Lavington but at Graffham Rectory. At the time of Manning's becoming Rector of Lavington, Mrs. Sargent lived at Graffham Rectory with her three young unmarried daughters; the eldest was married to S. Wilberforce, afterwards Bishop, in 1829. On the 7th of November, 1833, Manning married Caroline, the third daughter of Mrs. John Sargent, and granddaughter of Mrs. Sargent of Lavington House and Manor. The marriage ceremony was performed at Lavington Church by S. Wilberforce, then Rector of Brightstone, Isle of Wight—Manning and Wilberforce thus becoming brothers-in-law.

"When Manning left Oxford," as Mr. Thomas Mozley relates in his "Reminiscences of Oriel," "he passed rapidly and completely from politics to a high ecclesiastical part. He was heard of as a great speaker at religious meetings." The young undergraduate of three years ago, the fluent debater at the Union, was now transformed into a grave ecclesiastic; but true to the bent of his nature, he made use of his great gifts as a speaker, not now to excite the enthusiastic applause of his fellow undergraduates, but to win the hearts of grown-up men and women to the cause of religion. His voice was as persuasive and captivating, if not at Exeter Hall, at religious

meetings in the country, of the type common in that day of Evangelical ascendancy, as it had been at the Union.

It speaks well for his earnestness of character and great adaptability to circumstances, that Manning at the age of twenty-six should have so readily made himself at home in a little country village, and endeared himself so soon as their spiritual teacher and friend to the rustics of Lavington parish. The late Rector, the Rev. John Sargent, was an earnest Evangelical imbued with the spirit of Simeon, well known as one of the leaders and shining lights of the Evangelical Party. For 27 years he had lived and laboured in the united parishes of Lavington and Graffham. Parish and parsonage were imbued with his spirit. Fortunately for the peace of the parishioners and the Sargent family and household, Manning, like so many others who took later on a distinguished or leading part in the Tractarian movement, belonged to the Evangelical School. He did not bring down with him to Lavington the infection, in its seed-time, of Puseyism, as it was called in those days. Indeed as an undergraduate his time and thoughts were in the main devoted to the debates at the Union. There was a group of earnest young men who had gathered round Newman, and were laying, or preparing to lay the foundations of the future movement, destined to have such far-reaching consequences. But Manning was not one of these. The "Tracts for the Times" had not yet been started. Newman indeed was writing a series of letters to the *Record*,* to the starting of which well-known Evangelical paper he had subscribed, a few years before, a small sum. On coming up again to Oxford in the spring of 1832 to qualify for Orders, Manning did not remain more than a few months in residence. He was indeed comfortably settled some three or four months at the rectory of Lavington, when the future leader of the Oxford Movement opened the "Tracts for the Times" on the 9th of September, 1833, with these memorable words: "I am but one of yourselves, and a Presbyter."

Like Mr. Gladstone, Manning had left Oxford after taking his degree without knowing, without even a suspicion of the

* Newman's letters, in reply to attacks and misrepresentations of his religious opinions, were so mutilated by the Editor of the *Record* that Newman refused to continue the series.

religious ferment going on in the minds of Newman and Hurrell Froude, and of those under their immediate influence.

"When I left Oxford," Mr. Gladstone tells me to-day, "I should have said we were on smooth waters: there was no indication of the coming storm. From 'Thomas Mozley's Reminiscences' I first learnt that in Oriel there was a movement going on at the time. I cannot say whether I knew Hurrell Froude of Oriel, I think I did; I am not sure. But Manning knew nothing of Froude. I don't believe he was on terms of intimacy with Newman." Then he added: "How could he be: Newman was Fellow of Oriel, and held no office in the University, and Manning was an undergraduate belonging to another college."

Fortunately I can call the best of all evidence as to the way in which Manning discharged his ministerial duties as Rector of Lavington, and with what zeal he tended to the spiritual interests and temporal wants of his little rustic flock—the evidence of still living witnesses. One of these, whose unbroken friendship with Manning dates from 1833, describes Lavington as a model parish; the gentle influence of the Rector was everywhere felt; his administrative skill was apparent in every detail in the management of the parish as in the order and arrangement of the church. His kindness of heart and sympathy drew by degrees almost the whole parish to the little church. This eye-witness, who in those far-off days was a frequent visitor at the rectory, speaks with high appreciation of the aid offered to the Rector of Lavington by his wife in tending to the wants of the villagers, in visiting and comforting the sick or the afflicted, and in looking after the village school. Daily morning prayers were the rule in the little church. In the preface to the Prayer Book it is directed that "the curate that ministereth in every parish church or chapel shall say morning and evening prayer, and shall cause a bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God's word and to pray with him." "It was a picturesque sight," says this friend of Manning's, in his Lavington days, "to watch the zealous and stately Rector, vested in surplice, himself tolling the bell, whilst in the grey of a winter's morning the straggling villagers hurried to morning prayer before going out to their daily toil in the fields."

To inculcate the duty of daily prayer in the parish church was a task, which Manning set himself to with characteristic zeal. His simple and persuasive words, more than the tolling of the bell, drew by degrees the villagers to the little church for morning or evening prayer. It was one of the happiest results of his pastoral work. "The language of the English liturgy," as the Cardinal once remarked, "was no more and no less intelligible to my rustic congregation than would have been the Latin offices of the Catholic Church."

There is another living witness to Manning's work at Lavington—Mr. Gladstone. In a conversation with him a few years ago on this subject, Mr. Gladstone said: "Manning's devotion to his pastoral work had the most successful results; The population of the parish was small, but Manning told me that almost every parishioner was a communicant. That," added Mr. Gladstone, "was as it ought to be."

EPISODE II.

THE ELECT OF GOD.

1837.

There's a Divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough-hew them how we will.
Hamlet.

They, who believe not only in the Divine government of the world, but in the particular guidance of the lives of men, know also that God elects as he listeth the instruments to execute his Divine purpose, not blindly, but with a fore-knowledge of their special fitness for the work he has set them to do. It often comes to pass—how often who shall tell?—that men, elected of God, out of stubbornness of nature or in pride of heart, hearken not to the Divine call; turn aside from the way their feet were set to go; and sometimes, in perversity of nature, or out of self-will, seek unconsciously to construct insuperable barriers or obstacles to the designs which Providence has upon them. But God is patient and apt in the long run to win. Did not Saul of Tarsus kick against the goad; and after wrestling with the Lord in vain, go out, as an apostle of his Divine Master, to preach the gospel to the Gentile world?

"Circumstance, that unspiritual god," as Byron calls it, had more to do with shaping the course of Manning's life

than interior growth or gradual development of Catholic principles. There is nothing derogatory to his personal dignity in such a fact, and even if there were, we must bear in mind that God, instead of working an actual miracle either by direct revelation or a sudden change of heart, more commonly makes use of ordinary means to carry out his designs. "Circumstance, that unspiritual god," to which the knee of man is so often bent in worship, is after all but a creature of God's own making, a minister or slave to do His bidding.

Manning, in the beginning, even unto the end of his Anglican life was very susceptible to external influences; to the praise or blame of men, to public criticism or applause. Let me in brief outline record some of the facts and circumstances which, one after another, with accumulating force, ended in driving the Archdeacon of Chichester out of the church which he loved so well, and in which he believed with a faith as sincere as it was touching in its tenacity. He was an Anglican to the backbone; born and bred in the love and service of the Church of England; suckled at his mother's breast, as it were, with the milk of its teachings and traditions; and, as he grew in age and stature, with his years increased his love for the church of his birth and baptism. As a clergyman the Rector of Lavington was the most perfect type of his Order; the rectory, in its natural beauty, in its peace and piety and gladness of heart, was a model parsonage. In personal piety, in holiness of life, and in pastoral zeal, he was an exemplar to all men. He was consumed with zeal not only for the beauty of God's House, but for the spiritual and temporal welfare of his parishioners—dull rustics in a Sussex village. He loved the Church of England, for, in many ways, in its higher aspects and aspirations, it was a counterpart of his own nature; he loved its dignity and repose; its order and moderation, "primitive, yet purified," as he said and believed with all his heart, "the mother of many churches of the English race all over the world." It was English; and that alone, beyond and beside its higher claims, was a proud title, dear to the heart of the most English of Englishmen; who, in the natural order, loved above all things else, next to

his own church and home at Lavington, England and England's Church.

To Archdeacon Manning, from beginning to end, in spite of the encroachments, as he styled it, of the Civil Power on her spiritual rights and liberties; in spite of the "maimings and mutilations" she had suffered, the Church of England was the ideal church to be loved and glorified; to be delivered, indeed from bondage, but on no account in the vain search elsewhere, after higher truths or purer teaching, to be abandoned of her sons.

Unlike the illustrious leader of the Tractarian movement, Archdeacon Manning had not to wrestle with himself, with contending convictions, with growing doubts and perplexing fears. On the contrary, he had no fears or misgivings, was troubled by no perplexity of conscience; had a sublime confidence in the Anglican Church and in himself; in his position and authority as teacher appointed of God, as well as in the divine origin and blessed results of the Reformation, "that gracious act," as he called it, "of God's mercy towards the Church." With a supercilious wave of the hand he put the Church of Rome out of court. He treated her title-deeds and her history, her position in Christendom and her claims, with infinite disdain. He had erected for himself a tower of strength, of which he was at once the foundation, the main prop and pillar. He saw no rocks ahead, no shoals at his feet. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum.* Self-satisfied, he surveyed from the watch-tower of his own imagining "the wasting away of the powers of Faith; the trampling down of the rule of the spiritual order of the Western churches: the sensual infidelity of France, that may be traced to the communion of the Gallican Church: the corruptions of Italy; the sterility of Spain," and then contemplates once more with a serene eye and a confident heart the Church of England, which he glorifies as the "New Jerusalem:" as "the Regenerator of the Christendom that seems now dissolving—the future Centre of the Catholic world."

Such, then, was the man, as the event shows, elected of God, as Saul of Tarsus was to preach the gospel to the heathen, to convey the divine message at a critical hour to the men of

his own race and nation; to extend the boundaries and exalt the position of the Church in England. If it be temerarious to search into the counsels of Divine wisdom, infinitely more so is it to question or impugn God's judgment in the choice of His instruments. Yet to the natural eye, unlightened by the event, the election of such a man for such a purpose seemed, as men speak, a blunder. Were there not wise and holy men, not a few, trained in the schools of the Church? Or men, ready at hand, who had crucified the flesh and purified the spirit in many a monastic cell—docile sons, not born and sworn enemies of the Church, fitter instruments, as men judge, of God's designs to build up at the appointed period the Church in England than an alien to the Church; obstinate of nature, holding with the tenacity of a vice to his own opinions; dyed to the skin with the hue and colour of Anglican traditions and prejudices; bound, too, by ties in the natural order, in the beginning still unbroken, to the life of his own choosing. Be it so; yet in Saul of Tarsus, God chose an alien, an enemy, a persecutor, and not one of the devout and humble followers of the Christ ready at hand. In like manner, in our day, He elected for his divine purposes in England, an alien to the Church, a scorner of her doctrines and devotions; passing His elect meanwhile through the crucible of purifying fires, in order to cleanse and melt his heart; to make his stubborn will plastic as clay in the potter's hands. And did not the abiding faith, the unflinching fortitude, the wisdom and charity manifested in the life and labours of the great and good Cardinal justify once more to man the ways of God?

Manning's mind was a fortress impregnable to assault. He listened to no argument. He never parleyed with the enemy at the gate. Even to the Divine Voice, persuading him to a course or conclusion opposed to the bent of his intellect, or the bias of his will, not knowing It, he would have turned a deaf ear as to that of the enemy at the gate. On such a mind God, so to speak, had no hold. It afforded no grip to the Divine Hand. Appeals and arguments, which had moved the hearts and minds of other men, found no hearing at the bar of his judgment; no admittance into the closed recesses of his heart. Hence, to Saul kicking against the pricks, external circumstances came as ministers and messengers from God. The

Lord chastizeth them he loveth. He planted His cross in the heart of his servant. It was a blessing in disguise though he knew it not.

The happy home at Lavington, with its pleasant ways, its simple joys, its tranquillity and gladness of heart and deep domestic affection, which for well-nigh four years had made it to him a paradise on earth, was turned into a house of mourning: a home for ever after widowed of its earthly joys. It has rarely fallen to the lot of any of the sons of man to endure such a deep, abiding and unspeakable anguish of heart as befel the Rector of Lavington on the death of his young, sympathetic, and pure-hearted wife. In that sorrowful summer and autumn of 1837, when even the flowers of Lavington, which he loved so well and loved to the last—for they were constantly sent to him unto the end of his days as memorials of his early home—lay faded at his feet, widowed of their ancient gladness, he was wont, after his first anguish of heart had subsided, to sit for hours, day by day, at the grave of his wife, and compose his sermons.* When at last, he rose up from that silent grave, after, what he himself described as “a sort of grapple with what was crushing me” it was with sealed heart—with sealed lips—for henceforth he never more breathed her name to a living being. Not even to his nearest and dearest relatives in the intimacies of life, did he ever once allude to his wife or utter her name in joy or in sorrow. He was very reticent, indeed, even during her lifetime. A few years ago, in a conversation with Mr. Gladstone on Manning’s Anglican days, I happened to mention that this interesting episode in his life was a sealed book, unknown to all except a very few, who had a more intimate acquaintance with the Cardinal’s life, or with his few surviving contemporaries. In reply Mr. Gladstone said:—“I am not in the least surprised; Manning never spoke to me about his family or friends; and, intimate as I was with him for a time, he never once alluded to his wife, excepting in a few lines announcing her death.”

* Private Letter. In answer to an inquiry, a contemporary of the Cardinal’s wrote seven years ago: ‘I was a frequent visitor at Lavington in those days of sorrow; and often found Manning, seated by the graveside of his wife, composing h’s sermons. . . .’

In the frequent and intimate conversations I had with the Cardinal about his Anglican days he only alluded to the subject twice, and that in an indirect fashion. Once he said : " You may write just as you think fit about me in your ' Life,' I don't wish to see a page. But there is one Episode early in life which I wish to see in manuscript before it goes to the printers." Of course that passage, I knew, referred to his marriage.

On another occasion the Cardinal told me that he had received a letter from the Vestry people, announcing that the grave at Lavington was falling into decay, and asking for instructions about putting and keeping it in repair. " My reply was : ' It is best so ; let it be. Time effaces all things.' "

After long years, even unto the end of his life, Lavington still remained green in Manning's memory ; still dear to his heart. But it was characteristically associated in his mind, not with the days of stress and storm, but with the early beginnings of his life, when the little church of Lavington was his pride, his hope and the joy of his heart ; when his home under the shelter of the Sussex Downs—" an abode amid calm streams and green woody hills " of higher beauty still, I may add, an abode of peace and piety, dearer far to him than life as the home, for nigh upon four years, of the ministering angel of his heart and hearth, the co-partner of his joys and sorrows.

They, who have so often read the Cardinal's touching description of his home at Lavington, now that the veil over that hidden episode of his life—from that glad day in November 1833, when he was married to Caroline Sargent, to the dark day in July 1837, when he followed her to the grave in Lavington Churchyard—has with reverent hand, as befitting these pages, been lifted in part, will discover in those words now that their " true inwardness " has been revealed, an additional and deeper pathos :—" I loved . . . the little church under a green hillside, where the morning and evening prayer, and the music of the English Bible for seventeen years became a part of my soul. Nothing is more beautiful in the natural order, and if there were no eternal world I could have made it my home."

The following lines, as I feel and think, have a true and touching application here :—

Alas ! for Thou must learn,
Thou guiless One ! rough is the holy hand ;
Runs not the Word of Truth through every land,
A sword to sever and a fire to burn ?

If blessed Paul had stayed
In eot or learned shade,
With the priest's white attire,
And the Saints' tuneful choir ;
Men had not gnashed their teeth, nor risen to slay,
But Thou had'st been a heathen in thy day.*

EPISODE III.

THE PILGRIM PASSES OUT OF THE SLOUGH OF EVANGELICALISM. 1838.

The Rev. H. E. Manning has apostatized ; has fallen from the Gospel.—*Record.*

Favouring circumstances helped the young Rector of Lavington onwards and upwards, with many a break and backward steps not a few, towards the ultimate goal of his spiritual life—the Catholic Church, hidden almost up to the last from his unseeing eyes. A stumbling block was removed from his path by the translation of Edward Maltby, Bishop of Chichester, to the See of Durham. How great a stumbling block the first of the four Bishops of Chichester, under whom Manning served, must needs have been to him, will be abundantly apparent, when I record the fact, forgotten by Mr. Gladstone and of every one else, even of all those who have recently written about the late Cardinal, that he was that Bishop of Durham to whom Lord John Russell addressed in the year of the so-called “Papal Aggression,” his notorious “No Popery” Letter, which for awhile set all England ablaze with the frenzy of religious fanaticism. The Prime Minister appeals to the great Evangelical Bishop of Durham, as sharing with himself, to the full, abhorrence of Papists and Puseyites alike.

By his Bishop’s translation to Durham an obstacle was removed—may I not call it providentially removed?—and the way made easier for the Rector of Lavington ; for the charge

* Newman Verses on Various Occasions, p. 119, lxxiii, Warfare “Freely ye have received ; freely give.”

of the Diocese rested, henceforth, on the easy, sloping shoulders of a Bishop of no religious opinions in particular. Bishop Otter, the new Bishop of Chichester, was described by his contemporaries as being "neither fish, flesh, nor fowl," partly as a pun on his name; partly on account of the vagueness of his religious views, for he was neither High Church, Low Church, nor Broad. Ruled no longer by a Bishop of pronounced Evangelical views, Manning had a free hand and made use of his opportunity to the fullest. The sermon, he preached at the Primary Visitation of the Bishop, was an open avowal of High Church Principles, a public condemnation of popular Protestantism. The great Evangelical party, as narrow in its views as it was broad in its denunciations, bitterly resented Manning's "fall." It attacked the sermon as "a departure from the principles of the Reformation," as "substituting the traditions of men for the Word of God," as "shifting our Faith from a divine to a human foundation."

"In those days," Mr. Gladstone said to me in the course of conversation on the Cardinal's early religious opinions, "Manning was in the habit of sending me his sermons. I cannot, however, recall the exact time at which he ceased to sympathize or act with the Evangelicals." After reflection he added: "I remember, however, an incident which would fix the approximate date of Manning's passing out of the Evangelical school. He had sent me a sermon which he had just delivered, a sermon, I think, on Grace; I forget not only its title, but the date. It was an excellent and admirable sermon. Calling upon me soon afterwards, I told him so. In reply, Manning said, with a quiet smile, 'The *Record* has just proclaimed my apostacy, my fall from the Gospel.' The date of that sermon will show the time of Manning's break with the Evangelicals."

The Cardinal remembered the incident well, but had forgotten the title or subject of the sermon. Turning over the pages of the first volume of his sermons, he said: "Any of these would suffice to provoke the anathema of the *Record*."

The sermon was "The Rule of Faith," interesting on many accounts as the Cardinal's first essay in controversy. I must pass it by, however, as I have, for want of space, passed by so

much else of the highest importance. One feature of special interest, which I cannot omit in these pages, in "The Rule of Faith" is, that it shows Manning for the first time in conflict and controversy with Dr. Wiseman, the *Dublin Review*, and other Catholic writers in England.

EPISODE IV.

MANNING'S FIRST WORD ON PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

1838.

"Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me. It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks."

Between the delivery of "The Rule of Faith" and its publication with Appendix and notes, which convert an ordinary, learned sermon into a controversial Treatise of special interest, an article had appeared in the *Dublin Review*,* criticising and challenging the position, taken up by Keble and other Tractarian leaders on the subject of Private Judgment and Article VI. of the 39 Articles. This Review, an able Catholic Quarterly published in London, was the organ of Dr. Wiseman, the foremost champion of the Catholic cause in those days of eager controversy. Full of sympathy with the Tractarian movement and characteristically hopeful of its results, he watched and criticised every step, every position taken up by the Tractarian writers. This Catholic criticism in the *Dublin Review* of Keble's sermon, attacking the position taken up by Anglicans, as representing the faith of the Primitive Church, incidentally assailed and upset Manning's theory of the identity between the Rule of Faith in the Reformed Church of England and in the Primitive Church. Thus challenged by Dr. Wiseman and the *Dublin Review*, Manning buckled on his armour and entered for the first time into the arena of controversy.

After having established, to his own satisfaction, the identity between the Rule of Faith distinctly recognised by the English Church, and that of the Primitive Church, the author goes on to confirm his proposition, "by considering two fallacious rules, which have been, in later ages, adopted by the Church: both therefore *modern*, and condemned as novel, by universal tradition: I mean the rule of the Roman Church, and the rule that is held by all Protestant bodies, except the British

* July, 1838.

and American Churches. The former may, for distinctness, be called the Roman, and the latter from its extreme novelty the New.”*

The author then deduces from a work in great repute among the Roman Catholics in this country† the following propositions:—

1. That there is a living judge of interpretations, guided by an inspiration the same in kind with that which dictated the Holy Scriptures.

2. That the rule by which the judge shall proceed is ‘What was anciently received,’ &c.

3. That some points of *belief*, which if it means anything more than the sixth Article of the Church of England, must mean of *necessary faith*, were not committed to writing in Holy Scripture, but rest on *oral tradition alone*.

Acting on this rule, the Church of Rome at the Council of Trent, added to the Nicene or Constantinopolitan creed many doctrines which cannot be proved from Holy Scripture; e.g., transubstantiation, purgatory, invocation of Saints, veneration of images, indulgences, &c. A profession of this faith she requires as necessary for communion.”

The author then having defined the Roman Rule contrasts it with the Catholic [Anglican] in this way;

“The Church of Rome asserts that *oral tradition* is a sufficient proof of points of necessary belief:

The Church of England, that *Scripture* is the only sufficient proof of necessary faith.

The Church of Rome says, that the doctrinal articles added to Pope Pius’s Creed may be proved from Scripture, but need not:

The Church of England that they ought to be proved from Scripture, but cannot.

The Church of Rome maintains that they are binding because they are Apostolical traditions:

The Church of England denies that they are Apostolical traditions, inasmuch as they will not stand the Catholic test; not being *primitive*, nor have they ever been *universal*, or held with consent of all Churches.”

* “Rule of Faith Appendix,” p. 81. London, 1838.

† Berington and Kirk, *Faith of [Roman] Catholics*, p. 100.

The Rector of Lavington then defines what he calls the "New Rule," the rule of faith of popular Protestantism, and contrasts it with the Anglican as follows:

The other fallacious Rule is as follows :

That Holy Scripture needs no interpreter, but is plain to all.

But this is felt to be so evidently untenable that it is generally stated in this form :

That the Holy Spirit, which dictated the Scripture, now guides all who seek the truth into a right understanding of it.

Now here is exactly the same fallacy as in the Roman Rule above given. The Church of England carefully distinguishes between the immediate guidance of inspiration, and that guidance which leads men through the means God has ordained for the conveyance of truth.

After contrasting the two fallacious Rules of Faith with the true [the Anglican] the author says :—But we must go on to a still more instructive topic, namely, the close agreement of these two principles, notwithstanding their seeming irreconcileable opposition.

In the following six points they closely agree :—

1. Both exalt the *living judge*, or interpreter above the written rule.
2. Both claim a *special guidance*.
3. Both argue *à priori*.
4. Both oppose antiquity and universal tradition, and, as a natural consequence of all these,
5. Both introduce new doctrines.
6. Both, in effect, undermine the foundation of faith.*

The Rector of Lavington, having thus summoned the Evangelical Party and the Catholic Church before the bar of his own infallible judgment, passes sentence alike on the Evangelical Party, which he had just left, and on the Catholic Church, to whose tribunal, in after years, he submitted his mind and will.

Both the Roman and the new rule exalt the *living judge* or interpreter, above the *written rule*. That this is so, many decrees of councils and

* Ibid, p. 84-85.

popes will sufficiently prove. We need not quote the profane sayings of bygone controversy, expressing in too homely a way the malleableness of Scripture in the hands of the *living Church*. The maxim "Scripturæ sequuntur Ecclesiam" is enough. They have been made to follow the *living Church* with too ductile a pliancy. For it is plain, that the meaning of a mute document, if it be tied to follow the utterance of a *living voice* which shall claim the supreme right of interpretation, must vary with its living expositor. And in this lies the real danger of the Roman doctrine of Infallibility.*

Manning then quotes and makes his own long passages from Chillingworth, in which that apostate priest describes "the Pope as the real enemy of Christ, who, under the pretence of interpreting the law of Christ, doth, in many parts, evacuate and dissolve it; so dethroning Christ from his dominion over men's consciences, and instead of Christ, setting up himself." †

On this Manning remarks—

Although this investing of the Pope with infallibility is the *Italian* doctrine, the Gallican and British Romanists placing it in the Church assembled in council, I have quoted the whole passage for a two-fold reason. First, because it is equally applicable to the interpretation of the *living Church* in council; and, secondly, because, in the rashness of controversy, this passage, levelled against the *infallibility of the living judge*, whether Pope or Church, is turned against the very ground on which Chillingworth stood when he wrote it, i.e., *primitive and universal tradition*.

Manning then contends that Antiquity was sacrificed by modern Protestants in order to establish the right of Private judgment, and that the rejection of universal tradition has led to schism and Socinianism, but that the Church of England, reviving at the Reformation the rule of Faith of the Primitive Church, resists both Calvinism and Romanism by appeal to universal tradition.

In this controversial Appendix to a learned sermon, it is curious and interesting to note, that the future Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, one of the most active Fathers of a Council convoked to define the dogma of Papal Infallibility, speaks as Rector of Lavington his first word on "the Roman doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope." Between the Preacher

* Appendix, p. 85.

† Chillingworth, vol. I., pp. 11, 12, 13. Appendix 87.

on the Anglican Rule of Faith in Chichester Cathedral in 1838, and the Father of the Vatican Council in 1870, what a gulf ! What a difference between his first word on Papal Infallibility and his last !

EPISODE V.

MANNING'S FIFTH OF NOVEMBER SERMON AT ST. MARY'S, OXFORD. 1843.

*But Jonah rose up to flee unto Tarshish,
From the presence of the Lord.*

In the mind of the Anglican Rector of 1838 not a trace, as I have abundantly shown, is to be found of the principles in regard to the Papacy, held as a Catholic by the Cardinal Archbishop. The theory of "Continuity in Principle"—constructed, apparently, as an after-thought by the Cardinal, at the end of his life, to justify unto himself, if not to others, his ways as an Anglican in its beginning—breaks down under the weight of facts. There is not growth, but decline ; not progress in a Catholic direction, but retrogression between the principles, enunciated on the 16th of July, 1838, in the Cathedral of Chichester, and the "no Popery" principles, proclaimed in a "fifth of November" sermon in commemoration of the Guy Fawkes Plot, delivered in 1843 at St. Mary's, Oxford.

Two or three passages from "A Sermon preached on November 5, 1843, in commemoration of Guy Fawkes Plot," is all that I need recite here—passages that seem indeed more suited to the heated atmosphere of Exeter Hall than to that of St. Mary's, Oxford :—

The two Events which are united in the acts of this day (fifth of November), different as they are in their circumstantial, have this at least in common. They exhibit the mercy of God in preserving the English Church and people from the secular domination of the Roman Pontiff.

The conspiring against the king and the three estates of England was conceived, planned, and brought to the eve of perpetration by members of the Roman communion ; it was designed to advance the interests of the Roman Church. It was not indistinctly known, that some such attempt was in preparation. The intent was encouraged by the subtleties of casuistry, being directly defensible on principles prevalent and commended among the writers of that Church.

The Cardinal once said to me, "In all my writings I had, when I became a Catholic, but four pages to retract, and they

were not pages of passionate rhetoric, but of argument and calm reason.

But is not the insinuation that "the Gunpowder Plot" was encouraged by the subtleties of Roman casuistry, rather a rhetorical appeal to the popular Protestant prejudices, prevalent in that day than a conclusion founded on argument and calm reason?

"In the other Event the 'Most High' 'that ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will' confounded our adversaries in the very point wherein they had usurped upon His sole prerogative. They who had claimed 'the power to bestow the Empire on whom they listed,' who also said of themselves: 'We (the Popes) are to this end placed over the nations and kingdoms that we may destroy and pull up and plant"—saw, in one hour, the secret labours and confident expectations of many years scattered 'as a dream when one awaketh.'

In a note the Archdeacon says:—

No one can deny that the Revolution of 1688 was an event in Providence, nor that, by that event, the re-entrance of the Roman influence was prevented, and no member of the English Church can but look upon this as a mercy.

Then the Archdeacon goes on with his Fifth of November sermon as follows:—

A special Providence appears to have shielded this Church and realm from falling again under the secular dominion of Rome. Every time it has re-entered, it has been cast out again with a more signal expulsion; every time it has seemed to gather strength it has been more utterly confounded. The reign of Princes alien from the English Church has been twice brought to end with a speed truly significant: foreign armaments ignominiously baffled; conspiracies at home laid bare: the insinuations of secret emissaries detected and exposed: the whole line of the House of Stuart repelled by steady and uniform defeats. If a series of Providential acts may be read in combination, and thereby taken to express the purpose of the Divine Ruler of the world, it would seem to be the will of God, that the dominion of the Roman Pontificate may never again be set up in this Church and Realm.

After stating that "there are many duties to which this day of Commemoration (Fifth of November) recalls us," the Preacher proceeds to justify the Reformers, showing how "for

just causes and by a rightful authority the Roman jurisdiction was finally removed," and then he goes on :—

The principle on which the Reformers rested their act, and on which our relation to the Roman Church is still amply to be defended, is this—that there is no one Supreme prince or power in things temporal from whom the pastors of this Church derive apostolical succession : that both the Spiritualities and the Temporalities of this Church and Realm severally possess full authority and jurisdiction derived to them by succession and devolution ; and that both under Christ alone are, with their respective spheres, perfect and complete. There does not exist any fountain of jurisdiction below Christ, the head of all, on whose will and authority the acts of either for right or validity depend.*

The Preacher, it will be observed, does not stoop to argue, but contents himself with laying down in a tone of infallible authority a dogmatic assurance. His *ipse dixit* was to be accepted as all sufficing. This dogmatic certainty combined with his earnestness and good faith was the secret of Manning's influence in that day, when the hearts of men were shaken by the forebodings consequent on Newman's retirement to Littlemore.

Then as befits the Preacher of a Fifth of November Sermon the Archdeacon launches forth against the Catholic Church and the Popes :—

From two of the mightiest kingdoms of Western Europe this generation has seen the Church all but blotted out. At its very centre, it rests upon the deceitful calmness of a flood which at any hour may lift up its lowest depths and scatter it to the winds. They (the Popes) who once claimed to plant and to pluck up the thrones of Kings, now hold their own unsteady seat by the tutelage of Princes.

Lastly, Archdeacon Manning relapses into the prophetic mood, so common with him in those days, in which Cassandra-like he foretells evil days and terrible issues for the Church of Rome.

It was on account of this sermon, delivered on the morrow of Newman's retirement to Littlemore, and in the pulpit but now abandoned of him, that many men in Oxford, and out of it, never forgave Manning ; some remembered it against him as an act of treachery even to the end.

Speaking of the indignation which was felt by the Trae-

* *Ibid.*, p. 92.

tarian Party at the time, Mr. Gladstone said to me :—" Though neither the event nor name was mentioned of Newman's retirement to Littlemore, yet I know not, only that several of Manning's personal friends refused to speak to him after that sermon; and that Mr. Church, now Dean of St. Paul's, wrote a letter reproaching him for having pandered to Protestant bigotry at Oxford; but that, on Manning's paying a visit shortly afterwards to Littlemore, Newman refused to see him."

The truth is, that Manning in those days still sat, with eyes unseeing in the darkness, at the feet of a teacher who, under a false title and by misleading claims, held him captive; who beguiled in that day—and alas, still binds and beguiles for our sins perhaps, or for the sins of our forefathers, many a profound intellect; many a noble nature, too many a true and god-fearing heart. The day had not yet dawned; the day appointed of God—the star had not risen as yet which, like the Star that guided the wise men in the East, was to lead his "slow but sure steps" into the Church of God: was to lead the assailant of the Papacy at Chichester and Oxford into the Vatican Council as the foremost champion of Papal Infallibility: as a loving and obedient son of the Successors of St. Peter.

EPISODE VI.

THE HALF-WAY HOUSE AT LAVINGTON, 1845-7.

Drizza la testa ;
Non è più tempo d'andar si sospeso ;
Vedi colà un angel ; che s' appresta
Per venir verso noi.
Il Purgatorio—DANTE.

The part, which the Archdeacon of Chichester played in the crucial years of the Tractarian Movement, from the condemnation of Tract 90 to Newman's conversion in 1845,—with the exception of the episode in 1843—I have been compelled for want of space to pass over in these pages; for it must be remembered, that I only profess to give here, short episodes in a long and varied career. In those tempestuous years, the Archdeacon of Chichester was like a ship labouring in heavy seas, buffeted by contrary winds; driven by violent currents on to rocks and shoals; in apparent danger of making shipwreck of God's designs. Yet no, that ship, drifting about in the storm-winds, was a Vessel of Election, and was piloted by God's hand into a safe haven.

If God's mills grind slowly, they grind surely. His winnowing hand separates the chaff from the wheat in the souls of men, as the history of the change in Manning's religious opinions once more shows. Adverse circumstances, as I have already shown, had driven him back upon his ancient Protestantism, which he made use of, during temporary lapses, if I may so speak, from grace, as a house of refuge from the storm of popular fanaticism, which from all quarters, high and low, raged around the Tractarian Party. But yet Saul found it hard to kick against the goad.

Beyond that of witness at a distance, Archdeacon Manning had no lot or part in the greatest moral revolution, greater by far and more far-reaching and abiding than the struggle of Laud and the Non-Jurors, which has ever befallen the Anglican Church and the religious life of England. It was only after Newman's conversion, that Archdeacon Manning laid aside his neutral attitude and stepped down from his serene and lofty watch-tower into the open arena. He rallied the broken hosts, discomfited and disunited by the retirement of their illustrious leader from the battlefield into silent Littlemore. No one was better adapted for such a saving office than the Archdeacon of Chichester. He took under his protecting wing the unsheltered and orphaned children of the Oxford Movement. He inspired the timid with courage; brought back hope to the despairing; and lifted up the hearts of the downcast and dismayed. He inspired the souls of them that came to him in doubt, with their faces already turned towards Rome with all the confidence in the Church of England, which filled his own heart; yet when the shock of Newman's departure from out of the Anglican Church, though long expected, fell like a sudden surprise, men's minds reeled and their hearts sunk within them; they knew not what to do, whom to look to, whither to go. And as week after week, month after month, the long procession of them that went out with Newman in the year 45, that *annus mirabilis*, passed on before their saddened eyes they, who had not the faith, the hope, the heart to follow—the scattered remnant of the Tractarian vanguard, turned instinctively to Manning. His voice was heard like that of one "crying in the wilderness." He spoke, as one inspired, of the divine certitude of his faith in the Anglican Church. To the

afflicted of heart; the troubled in conscience; to those tortured by doubt, he presented the Anglican Church, "primitive yet purified," possessed "of purities in doctrine and practice wanting in the Christian Churches, whither in their impatience men had gone, seeking what was not to be found." One thing alone was wanting to the absolute perfectibility of the Church of England, and that was, her liberation from the bondage imposed upon her by the usurpations of the Civil Power. He directed their energies to this end, not only as good in itself, but as serving to divert their minds from doubts or controversial difficulties. His austere zeal, his earnestness, his personal piety and his dogmatic assurances attracted the hearts of men in that day of unrest. His confidence was contagious. He became a tower of strength to the weak or the wavering. The timid, almost frightened out of their wits by Newman's secession, were reassured; for men instinctively felt that under Manning's guidance, they were walking in the ways of safety and in the path of peace. "Safe as Manning" passed almost into a proverb in that time of panic. Thus it was, that the Archdeacon of Chichester stepped into the leadership of the remnant of the advanced Tractarian Party, vacated by the conversion of the illustrious leader of the Oxford Movement.

Lavington became, in the years that followed, a half-way house for pilgrims innumerable on their way to Rome. But the undoubting faith of Archdeacon Manning in the Anglican Church, the magic of his personal influence over the hearts and minds of men, his resolute will held too many a soul captive. For many—how many who shall tell?—of the pilgrims to Rome, Lavington was turned into a prison house. The captives were only set free when their great leader himself at last capitulated to divine Grace.

EPISODE VII. A SPIRITUAL RETREAT. 1847-8.

Come degnaste d'accedar al Monte?
Non sapei tu, che qui è l'uomo felice?
Il Purgatorio.—DANTE.

It is I; be not afraid.

In Archdeacon Manning's Diary, dated July 8th, 1847-8 is carefully recorded—often with great minuteness—the impressions conveyed to his mind by Catholic worship as presented

to his view, practically for the first time, in the Churches, Cathedrals, and Convents of Belgium and Germany; France and Italy. Secondly.—Events of public interest of which he was an eye-witness, notably at Rome, in 1848, when he watched with no idle curiosity the first beginning of the Italian Revolution, which led to the flight of Pope IX. to Gaeta; and finally, the men of name and note, the makers of history, with whom, especially in the City of the Popes, he was brought into close contact—the leaders of the Revolution, or its abettors, or its apologists on the one hand; and on the other, the defenders of the Catholic cause and of the Holy See, foremost among these, Pio Nono himself.

What imparts its special interest to Archdeacon Manning's diary is its spontaneous character. It was evidently not written with a view to publication. Indeed Cardinal Manning has more than once expressed to me his disdain for the idle folk who run up and down Europe, note-book in hand, jotting down remarks and reflections as material for book-making.

His own Diary is simply a daily record of events. It contains notes on men and things; friendly interviews with Catholic priests and monks in Belgium and Germany, France and Italy. Reflections on the method and character of Catholic worship; comparison between its objective presentation of Divine Truth and the Anglican system. Naturally, on his arrival in Rome, Archdeacon Manning's Diary expands and embraces in its purview a greater variety of subjects, not without interest to the politician as well as to the theologian or the student of ecclesiastical history. It records conversations and discussions on the moral, religious, and political state of Rome; on the laxity of ecclesiastical discipline; on the frequentation of the sacraments; on the Temporal Power of the Popes; on the relations of Pius IX. with Austria on the one hand, and the Revolutionary movement in Italy on the other.

The year in which Archdeacon Manning visited Italy and Rome, and of which his diary is a record, was, it must be remembered, a year of public turmoil and trouble throughout Europe, when other thrones beside the Pope's were attacked and shaken—the Revolutionary year, 1848—the birthtime, for good or evil, of great political, social, and religious changes in what

was once known as Christendom, but which can now only be described as a congeries of states morally independent of each other, and released from the ancient authority and bond of Christian Unity.*

It is curious to note with what avidity the leaders and spokesmen of the Revolutionary party in Rome confided their hopes, and views, and wishes to Archdeacon Manning, known to them only as an Englishman of distinction, a prominent member of the Anglican Church. They, who were familiar with the Rome of the Popes in those days, know with what untiring energy the leaders of the Revolution laboured to influence the public opinion of Europe. No visitor of distinction escaped their polite attentions. They pounced upon him and poured into his ear the real or imaginary grievances which the Romans had to endure under the Temporal Power. Archdeacon Manning listened to the violent harangues of Gavazzi, to the revolutionary theories of Padre Ventura, and to the propositions and plans of Cicceruachio, but it is characteristic of his intellectual acuteness to find, as his Diary often records, that he was able to separate the grain of wheat from the bushel of chaff. We often, for instance, find in these pages the Anglican Archdeacon in his discussions with the politicians of Rome—Priests or Monks, as well as laymen—defending the Sovereign rights of the Pope and the authority of the Church against the partizans of the revolution led away, as so many were in 1848 by the promises of the Italian Unity.† Sometimes, indeed, Archdeacon Manning seems to have been captivated or captured by the specious arguments advanced by the more moderate or more astute opponents of the Temporal Power, or at any rate, to have given an apparent acquiescence to the revolutionary theories propounded by men like Padre Ventura. It must be remembered that, at the date of Archdeacon Manning's visit to Rome in the spring of 1848, the Revolutionary character of the Italian Movement was not fully recognised.

* Vide Cardinal Manning's "England and Christendom," p. in appendix.

† Miss R. H. Busk, the author of that famous book, "The Folk-lore of Rome," and many other popular works on Italy, speaking of the Revolution in Rome, writes to me as follows :—"What turned people, who did not care a fig for Italian Unity, to submit to the revolution was, as I know well from talking to them, the promises which the revolutionists made that they were going to bring in an El Dorado."

Many good Catholic priests as well as laymen, indulged in the dream of a United Italy under the headship of the Pope. In the beginning of his reign, Pio Nono himself, carried away by his generous instincts and love for Italy, held out hopes that he would as Sovereign Pontiff bestow his blessing on the Italian Movement ; send his army into the field against Austria ; and promised, if Padre Ventura is to be believed, on the morrow of victory to crown at Milan Carlo Alberto, King of Piedmont, with the Iron Crown. All these hopes and vain dreams were dissipated and destroyed by the famous Allocution of the 29th April, 1848,* by which Pius IX, forced by their maliciously extravagant claims and demands, broke with the Revolutionary party—the character of which was only too manifest, not only by the principles which they enunciated, but by their rebellious acts and misdeeds. The assassination of Rossi, the Pope's Prime Minister, on the steps of the Chancery forced Pius IX. into a life-long antagonism with the revolution.

Archdeacon Manning, arriving in Rome not more than a week after this break with revolutionary Liberalism, found men's minds in a state of ferment. Many priests with whom he came in contact were loud in condemning the action of the Pope. In the diary will be found a passage† in which the well-known Padre Ventura heaps words of insult and contumely on the head of Pope Pius, whom but a week or two before he had extolled as " An angel from Heaven " as " Divine love incarnate."‡

Cardinal Manning now tells me that many of the priests and monks, described in his diary as loud and clamorous in the revolutionary cause, are to-day good and holy priests ; several of them high in office and dignity. " From one, perhaps the most violent and extreme, I have to-day," added the Cardinal, " received a letter ; he is now a prelate in Rome, and something more."

One of the chief features in the Diary are the copious notes on sermons delivered in various churches at Rome. The Archdeacon appears to have been a regular attendant, his criticisms on the sermons are interesting, and still more so the synopsis

* Vide the Allocution in Appendix of the " Life."

† Diary, Rome. p. 67.

‡ Vide Appendix.

which he draws out of the argument used by the preacher. These "skeleton sermons" may have offered years afterwards to the newly ordained Priest of Westminster topics and suggestions for some of those striking discourses* which he delivered at the Jesuit's Church in Farm Street, or at St. Mary of the Angels, Bayswater.

At some of the Monasteries, which he was in the habit of visiting, Archdeacon Manning appears to have been catechized more than once by the good monks as to his own ecclesiastical position, and as to how his religious creed differed from ordinary Protestantism. It is not difficult to conceive the surprise if not indignation, felt by Archdeacon Manning—one of the great leaders and lights of the Anglican Church—at being challenged by simple Italian monks to show his right to the name of Catholic, and still more at being cross-questioned as to the character of his Orders. From one passage, at least, in the Diary the Anglican Archdeacon appears to have thought that the zeal of his catechists was not always tempered by discretion. On one occasion at Assissi he accounts for the controversy running somewhat high by the absence of the more moderate-minded or discreet Prior. The Anglican Branch Church theory seems to have surpassed the understanding of these simple and straight-forward Italian monks. On taking leave of his monastic friends on his departure for England, the venerable Prior,† with tears in his eyes, kissing Archdeacon Manning on both cheeks implored him on his return home to consult some competent English Catholic on the vital difference between Protestantism under every variety of form and the Catholic Church.

One curious peculiarity of the Diary is the careful daily record kept at Rome of the wind and weather. In this, if in nothing else under heaven, Archdeacon Manning resembled Pugin, the great reviver of Gothic Art, who would almost as soon have omitted his morning prayers as his daily weather chart. The Diary, I may add, is illustrated by frequent pen-and-ink sketches of shrines and altars, of ruined towers, and of churches of special interest, often accompanied by elaborate ground plans exhibiting no mean architectural knowledge and

* Date, and date of publication of early Catholic sermons.—*Ibid.*

† Padre Luigi, Prior of "Gli Angeli" at Assissi, date—May 14, 1848.

skill. From the copious materials afforded by this Diary I proceed now* to give at large such extracts as illustrate the important events of which Archdeacon Manning was an eye-witness in Rome in the critical year of 1848; or as record his opinions, religious or political; or his often acute comments on the events he witnessed; or on the leading men, ecclesiastical or lay, with whom he was brought into close, often intimate contact during his long stay at Rome. It will be conducive also to the fuller understanding of the state of his mind and feelings at this critical period of his life, if I recite such passages, even if unimportant or of no present interest, as are characteristic of the writer, or show the tendency of his mind at a time when he had, as the Germans so well express it, no *Ahnung* as yet, that he stood at the threshold of that far-famed and mighty Church, of which, in after years, he was predestined to become not only a faithful son, but a most eminent defender, bearing witness among his own people to its Divine character and to the Infallible Authority of its Supreme Head.

EXTRACTS FROM ARCHDEACON MANNING'S DIARY IN BELGIUM,
JULY 9-20, 1847.

Diary—Page 1: July 8. From London by railroad at half-past one. Dover, six o'clock.

July 9. From Dover at seven a.m. Ostend, half-past eleven; by rail at three to Bruges; from Bruges at five to Gand.

July 10. At Gand. The Beguinage, a long square of houses with walled gardens, and in the centre the Church; all of red brick with a Dutch look. At two by railway to Malines.

An annual fair exactly opposite to the windows of the hotel, and the noise all day till eleven at night ceaseless.

At the Cathedral Saturday evening; the *Salut* and Exposition. The Procession gave me a strong feeling of the reality of the Incarnation and of their way of witnessing to it. This morning, High Mass with much splendour. The Elevation very solemn and impressive; vivid by exhibiting the One Great Sacrifice. The Church very full all the morning—many

* That is to say, in the "Life."

thousands. At Vespers about six or seven. Priests and a choir of 20 or 30. Full end to end.

The Church S. Aloysius attached to the Beguinage. Great number of religious in white and in black hoods. The responses were made from the North East corner behind a screen. I conceive by a sisterhood. Mr. Daviney said by the choir. I doubt it, as the voices were certainly women's. He said the processions were of women, a Priest carrying the Host.

12. Saw the College Communal, a school for boys from eight to fifteen, with choice of profession, about 125; then the *Petit Séminaire*, where were about 330: three courses—Humanity, Philosophy, Theology. Here the choice is made: They study in humanity,—years, in philosophy,—years, in theology,—, and then go to the *Grand Séminaire*.* This was much like S. Sulpice (at Paris), but the rooms better furnished with more of personal comfort. S. Sulpice has a severer character. Bare walls, a bed, a table, chair, bookcase, and crucifix. Good library, and a most brotherly and intelligent priest who showed it to us. Then the Frères de la Misericorde, instituted by M. Scheppers. He was ordained 16 years ago, at the age of 30. In 1839 he began to attend the prisons with three subjects; they are now 60. The old prison system by Gardism—old soldiers and by force; now it is wholly by religion and blessed with great success. He showed us the house, refectory kitchen, chapel, sacristy, cloisters, and school. He was an open, clear, sincere, kindly energetic man, *γενστός*, but did not impress me with a feeling of height or depth. But there was about him the balance and peace of a man who had found his place and calling in God's kingdom for life, and was moving onward without distraction. This appears to me to be one of the fruits of the objective church-system, of dogmatic theology, the celibacy of the priesthood and the monastic life.

The brothers all laymen. They take the three vows. Their novitiate is in all about three or four years. In the Refectory is a tall panel having an *Ordo*, showing what Brothers are out and where. Also another for the novices. He showed us the reliques under the Altar; and also others in the sacristy. I

* The Archdeacon left the number of years blank, for future enquiry.

[No. 2 of Fourth Series.]

could not but feel the effect of such objects is to awaken and keep alive a high standard of personal devotion. A theory at least which we have not. Also the whole objective worship gives a reality we have nothing to equal.

12. The Priest at the *Grand Séminaire* told me that in the Diocese of Malines there are 1500 priests; and that the Archbishop meets them all in retreat once in three or four years at various places—the *Séminaire* in Malines and other places in the Diocese.

The population of Belgium is about 4,000,000; and of Brussels about 200,000.

13. M. Bougueaux showed us the Chapel and Convent of the Visitation Nuns; the Supérieure had been 37 years in the Order at Annecy in Savoy, Nice, Paris, and Bruxelles. They have only seven Sisters here, and lay Sisters. Then to the Dames de Marie who have 15 Sisters, and conduct the education of 600 girls (100 paying) in schooling, lace-making, etc.

In the Chapel were four or five sisters. They have about 600 in all; a house in London with—Sisters, a house at Falmouth, Oregon, America. The Redemptorists have only six Fathers, and are at work sometimes from half-past five a.m. to twelve in the Confessional. There are 22 Religious Houses in Bruxelles, and more nuns than before the French Revolution. I could not but be struck by the calm happy look of everyone I saw. They seemed at rest, as if they had said:—"This shall be my rest for ever."

There are in Belgium six dioceses, Malines (Archbishopric), including Brussels and Antwerp; Gand, Bruges, Liège, Namur, and Tournay.

14. To Louvain with M. Bougueaux. Population 30,000; seven parishes, including religious houses and their chaplains. Liège, 75,000; diocese, 600,000. Parishes small, 300 or 400, some two, four, and eight thousand, but few. This from the Grand Vicaire.

M. Bougueaux said the Catholics did not make, but only profited by the Revolution of 1830. There were only two bishops from the Battle of Waterloo, Malines and Ghent. King William for five years forbade the great seminary to receive any more students. He wished to make Pope Adrian's

College a philosophical system—Liberal. The students there, although Rev., were never ordained as being unfit.

King William's professors are Liberals, Infidels; the University supported by the town and the yearly church collections and all the clergy. The bishops send their best men for two, three, and four years from their seminaries.

Heard a disputation for degree of Doctor and on appeals from the Pope, in Latin. The University has very little property; the State will not create corporations, nor suffer mortmain. In ten years M. Bougueaux hopes they may be able. The library, a fine one, belongs to the town; students 600; several colleges—one theological, others for law and medicine. Bellarmine preached in Latin at S. Peter's.*

16. Went to Antwerp. At the Cathedral, the Chapel of the Holy Heart.

In the diary a blank space is left here, evidently in the view of recording later on the impressions made on the writer by Antwerp, perhaps the most Catholic city in Belgium, certainly the most interesting and the most artistic. Archdeacon Manning at that period evidently was not familiar with Catholic terminology as used in England. For instance, he translates the French *Sacré Cœur* by Holy Heart; and uses the French word *Salut*, instead of speaking as English Catholics do of the Sacred Heart and of the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. After coming into personal contact with English Catholic Ecclesiastics at Rome, he adopts in his Diary, as will be observed later on, Catholic phraseology.

But to resume the extracts from the diary :—

17. In the afternoon to Liége, a town lying in a valley with hills to the N.W. and S. Many open places.

On the margin is a pen and ink sketch of the town. The diary is illustrated by frequent sketches of monuments of interest, ruins of churches and chapels and colleges, especially during his prolonged stay at Rome.

* This entry, which has no connection with the subject recorded in the diary, appears to be the result of a mental note, the record of one of the *obiter dicta*, heard in the course of conversation with his Belgian friends. It illustrates one of Cardinal Manning's most characteristic habits of mind, the power of gathering up and assimilating knowledge—the secret of a well-stored mind.

Palace of the Prince Bishop is fine. Inside, a cloister or perystyle like the Doges Palace at Venice, and the streets o Bologna. St. Martin's on a high and fine site.

The Feast of Corpus Christi first kept in that Church by the Canons. Liège alone has with Rome the privilege of perpetual Exposition four days in each church. The Parish Priests gave tickets to the devout, assigning the number and succession of hours for the perpetual adoration, the night-hours are kept in their houses, the day-hours in their church (the forty hours).

Went to S. Catherine where a Jesuit preached to the Society *de la bonne Mort*: Church full. In the evening to the Grande Séminaire to see Dr. Kein.

The Seminary an old Convent of the Augustinians. Their books still there. A good Church in the Palladian style, the low large lamps of brass burning before the high Altar, very solemn. He said he bought them in 1835 for sixty francs. I cannot but feel that the practice of elevation, exposition, adoration of the Blessed Eucharist has a powerful effect in sustaining and realizing the doctrine of the Incarnation.

19. To Aix-la-Chapelle through a beautiful country—a mixture of North Wales, the South Downs, Stroud, and Dovedale.

Aix a German Basle. First Vespers of S. Margaret. A long funeral procession, the streets were dressed with streamers from the windows. In one Church orange trees within the sanctuary. In another a large congregation to the Salut. I observed—

1. The great number of men, and some *young*;
2. The deep devotion. They responded as one voice: were vividly penetrated by an idea and a spirit;
3. The use of the rosary by many men—well-dressed, and by some poor men with great devotion. One man with a lame left arm—like Simpson in face.
4. The lifting of the hands, the little (3) Acolytes before the altar.
5. The parents crossing their children with holy water. The children crossing themselves.
6. The devout kneeling down on the marble pavement, coming in and out.

The whole very impressive, implying a deep hold on the conscience and the will.

It seems strange that here on the moral site of the W. Empire and the Mediæval Europe there should be still an energy beyond anything I have seen elsewhere. Is there not a moral reason to explain this?

20. At Aix. The Cathedral—a Temple Church built by Charlemagne, destroyed and rebuilt by Otto on the same site in 980 A.D. It consists of one octagon nave; a choir of the date of Westminster Abbey. There is a very old square tower at the west end; north-west, a chapel of the decorated time; south-west, a chapel of the debased Italian.

Here follows a ground plan of the Aachen Cathedral in pen and ink.

In the middle of the nave a plain slab with *Carolo Magno*. His stone chair on six marble steps is up in the Triforium. I could not help feeling as if I stood over the spring of a great power which had still hold upon us. It is the fountain of Modern Europe—of the Mediæval Church and Empire; of the temporal element of our national, legal, and Christian civilization.

The passages which I have given are of interest and importance, as from a Diary recording Archdeacon Manning's first visit to Catholic Belgium; his first contact with Catholic life and Catholic worship, not so much if at all, on account of the facts of more or less interest put on record, as because the daily chronicle reveals, simply and naturally and with no foregone conclusion, the state of mind of the Anglican Divine, the leader at that date—in succession to the illustrious John Henry Newman, then studying for the priesthood at Rome—of the Tractarian Movements, when brought for the first time face to face with the living Catholic Church, as seen in its actual working, spiritual, religious, and social. For such a purpose Catholic Belgium was a good field for observation. Archdeacon Manning showed himself—as his twelve days' research among Catholic Institutions, social and religious, proves,—a clear-sighted and candid observer of men and things. He was more; for the reflections, sparse as they naturally are in such a

homely chronicle, show that his mind was going to the roots of things—to the differences, fundamental in their character, between the Catholic Church in practice as well as in theory, and the Church of his birth and baptism. Archdeacon Manning was, indeed, acquainted with the Primitive Church, the Church of the Ancient Fathers; with the Church of Rome, only, however, as known in history more or less truly; but not with that practically to him invisible Church, with which he, as an Anglican, claimed kinship. For the Church of Rome, as made known to him in its actual life and working, came to him in some sort as a new revelation. To judge, at least from some reflections in the diary, the effect produced by the dogmatic teaching and the objective system of Catholic worship was not altogether favourable to the conduct and claims of the Anglican Church.

Be that, however, as it may, it is evident at that time Archdeacon Manning did not consider himself an enemy in a hostile camp. He presented himself as a truce-bearer to the Church, which did not recognise him as one of her sons. He was received by the priests and monks of Belgium as a friend among friends. Every Church was open to him; at every monastery he was a welcome guest. From him no information was withheld. The secrets of the prison-house, which Mr. Newdegate—then almost an unquestioned authority on convents—used to denounce in and out of Parliament, were not revealed to him, only because there were none to reveal.

Archdeacon Manning made the most of his Belgium friends and of his opportunities; as he did when he reached Italy and made himself at home in Italian monasteries and with Italian priests and monks. No Anglican Divine of name and note, as far as I know, was ever on such intimate terms with Catholic priests and monks—not in England, indeed, but abroad—as Archdeacon Manning during his twelve months sojourn in Catholic lands. In this spiritual retreat, God laid deep in the heart of his elect the foundations of his future faith.

EPISODE IX.

WRESTLING WITH THE ANGEL OF THE LORD.

1848-51.

A voi venia la creatura bella
 Bianco vestita e ne la facia, quale
 Par tremolando mattutina stella.
 Le braccia apperse ed inde aperse l'ale ;
 Disse : Venite que son presso i gradi ;
 Ed agevolamente domai si sale.

Il Purgatorio.—DANTE.

I must pass lightly over in these pages the years that intervene before the divine Grant ordained of God. I can do no more than merely allude to the year 47-48, when the Anglican Church was again racked and rent by a bitter controversy, provoked by Lord John Russell's appointment of Hampden, a Semi-Arian, as Bishop of Hereford. Bishop Wilberforce made the welkin ring with his vigorous protests and denunciations. He took the foremost part in the movement, called meetings all over the country, which, in spite of the fact, that Lord John Russell was the dispenser of the highest ecclesiastical patronage, were attended by Deans and Archdeacons and other dignitaries, at which Resolutions were passed in condemnation of the action of the Government. No fewer than fourteen Bishops protested against the appointment of Dr. Hampden, already censured by Convocation at Oxford as holding erroneous opinions. It was all in vain. Lord John Russell was obstinate and stood upon his rights; Bishop Wilberforce was weak and bent *more suo* before the storm.

In that year of ecclesiastical hubbub and turmoil where, it was asked, was Archdeacon Manning? Was there no room for two Richmonds in the field? Bishop Wilberforce, in a letter to a friend, related how, on telling "the Bishop of London, that Manning had gone to Rome on account of his health, the Bishop wickedly replied, 'I thought he had gone to Rome after the publication of his last Volume of sermons.'"^{*} We know, as I have already shown, how Archdeacon Manning providentially delivered from awkward entanglements, spent that year—for the Anglican Church, a year of controversy and turmoil; for him, a year of peace and spiritual meditation. What fresh fuel would it not have added to the fires of Ultra-Protestant

^{*}In Wilberforce's diary this anecdote is related as referring to the year 1838—evidently an error.

fanaticism, had it been known, as it would have been in our inquisitive day of telegraphs and of special correspondents, that, instead of fighting the Anglican battle at home, the Archdeacon of Chichester was to have been seen, day after day, Sundays included, in the Churches of Rome, kneeling in devotion before the Blessed Sacrament at Benediction, or at the Elevation in the mass : or spending his afternoons at many a Monastery, discussing theology with Italian Monks. It was for him a time of retirement, of meditation and searchings of the heart: a veritable seed-time of grace, which, within three years, produced a rich and abounding harvest.

If the appointment of Dr. Hampden as Bishop of Hereford was a striking evidence of the triumph of Erastianism, it brought sorrow and dismay to the heart of Archdeacon Manning, for it traversed the one principle, which he held sacred alike as Evangelical, as High Churchman, and as Catholic—the principle of the supremacy of religion, the independence of the Church in all matters appertaining to faith. But worse still was in store : for the Gorham Judgment, by which a Civil Tribunal declared that baptism may be either held, or denied, by a clergyman in the Church of England without offence or forfeiture of his rights, was a signal manifestation and exercise of the Royal Supremacy. The High Church party were in consternation and dismay. The tenour of the Judgment of the Court of Appeal reached the ever-open ear of the vigilant Archdeacon of Chichester, early on the morning of the fatal day, on which it was to be delivered. He hastened to communicate the fatal tidings to Mr. Gladstone, with whom he was wont in those days to take counsel. Starting up, for owing to some slight ailment he was still in his own room, Mr. Gladstone, throwing up both arms, exclaimed, "Then the Church of England is ruined, irretrievably ruined."* The famous Protest touching the Royal Supremacy in matters ecclesiastical, couched in resolute and uncompromising terms, was drawn up by Archdeacon Manning, and signed by the leading representatives, lay and clerical, of the High Church Party.† It was but a *brutum fulmen* as far as the

* This incident was related to me in 1887 by Cardinal Manning.

† The protest was signed, amongst others, by "H. E. Manning, Archdeacon of Chichester; R. J. Wilberforce, Archdeacon of East Riding; W. Hodge Mill, Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge."

signatories were concerned. The Protest was disregarded. The Rev. Charles J. Gorham was inducted into his benefice in spite of the refusal, and without the authorization of Dr. Phillpotts, the lion of the fold of Judah, as the famous fighting Bishop of Exeter was described in those days. The rest of the Bishops acquiesced in, or tamely submitted to, the Erastian procedure of the State. Of the Signatories to the Protest six became Catholics; but the majority either, like the Bishops, acquiesced, or remained sullen and silent; one to this day—the Venerable Archdeacon Denison—still fills the air with piteous jeremiads over the shameful lapse of the Church of England into Erastianism. As a result of this fruitless Protest and of the inaction of the Bishops, too many of the ancient Tractarian party drifted into the wilds and wastes of Agnosticism.

Things began to settle down. The Gorham Protest was only one Protest the more, that had been whistled down the wind. Archdeacon Manning as yet showed no outward sign. In spite of searchings of heart, he clung still with the hope of despair to the Church of his baptism, seeking and striving whether he might yet find in her living traces of God's presence. Time went on. The fatal Gorham Judgment had been accepted by the Church of England; the Royal supremacy recognised. The Ides of March had come and gone. Yet Manning still made no outward sign. He was silent. Perhaps he was meditating in his heart on the words he spoke at the time of Newman's retirement to Littlemore:—"This, then, is no season of controversy, it is a time for deeds and not for words; we must do and not talk great things."

But at that "time for deeds," the Archdeacon of Chichester did not do "great things"—great things of the nature of those done by Newman and so many others. Was there, then, not a danger—lest the test and trial year of 1850 should not pass for Manning, still kicking against the goad, as had passed the year '45, that *annus mirabilis* of Divine Grace? In that troublous hour for the Anglican Church: that day of sorrow for so many of our separated brethren, a Novena was held in celebration of the opening of the Church of St. Barnabas, Pimlico. Frequent and fervent prayers and communions were offered up, day by

day, by pious congregations for the deliverance of the Church in that day of trial from the bondage of the Civil Power. *

During the Novena, within the octave of the consecration of the Church of St. Barnabas, 1850, all the chief leaders or defenders of the High Church party preached, morning and evening. Among the preachers were the Bishop of London, Bishop Wilberforce, Archdeacon Manning, Dr. Pusey, Keble, Sewell, H. W. Wilberforce, Neale, Bennett, Upton Richards, the incumbent of Margaret Street Chapel in succession to Frederick Oakeley, and Dr. Mill, the Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge. All these representatives, both of the High Church and Tractarian party, one after another from the pulpit of St. Barnabas, denounced the Gorham Judgment, just pronounced by the Privy Council, in terms of righteous indignation; or bewailed the condition of the Church of England "under the stunning blow," as Dr. Pusey said "inflicted upon her;" or exhorted, like H. W. Wilberforce, the Bishops to defend "the sacrament of baptism against attack, and to preserve the unity of the Faith." Of all these preachers, Archdeacon Manning alone was silent; he made no allusion to the Gorham Judgment; he had not a word to say against the reproach "that the last vestiges of Catholicism are gone, or are at least rapidly passing away from sight."†

If the Archdeacon of Chichester had not as yet, since the fruitless Protest, lifted up his voice before the face of the Church in condemnation of its acceptance of the Gorham Judgment, in his private letters, he shows, that his heart was wounded to the quick. Out of the numerous private letters kindly placed in my hands, I can only quote here a few passages, referring to the most critical period in Manning's life—the time of trial for his heart and soul, that followed the

* W. H. Mill, D.D., p. 373. Sermons preached at St. Barnabas, London. W. J. Cleaver, 1850.

† Among the congregation were Lord and Lady Fielding, afterwards Earl of Denbigh, penitents of Archdeacon Manning, who, as Catholics, some years later, dedicated to Catholic uses the Church at Pantasaph, which they had, as Anglicans, intended to devote to the service of the Church of England. Lord Denbigh has soon followed the Cardinal, his revered teacher, guide, and friend. Let us hope and pray that he too, has entered into Eternal rest in reward for his faith and fidelity.

Gorham Judgment. I take the following passage from a letter addressed to a near relative, dated—

My dearest ———,

Lavington, June 18th, 1850.

. We are in a trial greater than I have ever known, and fraught, I believe, with the gravest consequences. But first let me tell you to believe nothing of me but what comes from me. The world has sent me long ago to P. IX.; but I am still here, and if I may lay my bones under the sod in Lavington Churchyard with a soul clear before God all the world could not move me. I am both calm and patient, deeply sad indeed, and reduced to silence. For I am compelled to acknowledge that the laws, which I believe to be divine, are violated. People tell me to trust and love the Church of England; who has trusted or loved it more? Who loves it more now, even when the foundations of trust are shaken? My contest now is with the State and the world; with secular Churchmen and those who of a divine would make it a human Society, or at the best a Protestant Communion. And I feel, that the love of our Divine Lord will keep us all safe. It is His goodness which gives me the consolation of so many loving hearts, and yours among the kindest. May He bless you both.

H.E.M.*

In another letter, Archdeacon Manning speaks of his own advisers, whom he names, "I think, abler, calmer, and safer, I could hardly find. No—no mind has any influence to hurry me beyond my own judgment Therefore, be so far at ease about me."† This letter was written in the view of putting at ease the minds of so many of his intimate friends, who were under grave apprehension, that Manning, after the Gorham Judgment (March 8th), was being hurried on by others beyond his own judgment. On the same subject, the following passages occur in a letter dated—

My dear ———

Lavington, June 30th, 1850.

It is part of the trial, that so few really see the peril and the crisis. This week I hope to send to the Press a letter to the Bishop of Chichester. Archdeacon Harrison‡ comes to-morrow and will go over it with me: then Gladstone and Hope. I shall then see my way more clearly. Believe me it is most calm, guarded and weighed—but it goes home. Write as often as you can for it cheers me. I thank God, that I have so little to bear from those I love in this hour of trial. But you all trust at least my heart before God.

H.E.M.

* Private Letters. † Ibid.

‡ Archdeacon Harrison was one of the two most intimate of Manning's friends in his Anglican days—Mr. Gladstone was the other—a friendship cherished to the last, though since the Cardinal became a Catholic they met

The Archdeacon's letter to the Bishop of Chichester, entitled "The Appellate jurisdiction of the Crown" appeared on July 2nd, 1850. It was, as described in his letter above, most calm, guarded and weighed, and if it failed, not to go home, but to bear the results he desired, it was from no want of lucidity of statement or logical conciseness or force of argument. Its moderation in tone, displayed in every line, enhanced the effect of absolute conviction. It was a masterpiece of lucid statement and subtle reasoning, and if it failed in its purpose, it was, because the idea, which Archdeacon Manning ever held of the Independence of the Church of England, was not consistent with the legal position of the Establishment. A most appropriate passage on the Gorham Judgment and the Appellate jurisdiction of the Crown occurs in the "Synopsis," which, in 1837, the Cardinal put down on paper concerning his religious opinions in his Anglican days.

The belief in the Independence of the Church as a divine witness—a doctrine ever held by Archdeacon Manning—received a severe shock by the decision of the Court of Appeal in the Gorham Case. It was an assertion of the Royal Supremacy in a matter of faith, fatal to the principle, that the Church was the Supreme judge as to the valid ministry of the Faith and Sacraments of Christ.

In a letter addressed to the Bishop of Chichester, Archdeacon Manning shows how this principle is violated and the Independence of the Church denied by the decision of the Privy Council "that the doctrine held by Mr. Gorham is not contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England."

Since the Gorham judgment, Spring had passed away and Summer ; Autumn had come, and yet Archdeacon Manning made no sign. What did it mean ? Strange rumours were abroad. Many hoped, and some, a few, feared, that an open door had been found ; a way of escape discovered for Manning.

Mr. Gladstone, in the view of retaining his friend in the Anglican Church, had from time to time endeavoured to induce

only once at York Place. Archdeacon Harrison, who died only a few years ago, and his wife were frequent visitors at Lavington. In a recent letter after the Archdeacon's death, Mrs. Harrison says :—"At Harrow, the Cardinal and my brother Charles Thornton (afterwards Incumbent of Margaret Stuart Chapel) walked together as friends ; and in after years at Ch. Ch.—my husband—those three were as brothers.—Sincerely yours, Isabella Harrison."

Bishop Wilberforce to obtain from the majority of the Bishops, after the promulgation of the Gorham Judgment, a Declaration, that they would uphold the doctrine of the Church as regarded Baptism ; and even though the declaration was not of the nature of a corporate action, yet he believed such a step would have held secure to the Church not only Archdeacon Manning, but many others, who, like him, were longing for some authoritative Declaration.

All these attempts, however, proved abortive. In a letter dated September 5th, 1850, to Bishop Wilberforce, Mr. Gladstone states, that from the conversations which had taken place and the letters which had passed between Archdeacon Manning and himself, an impression was created in his mind, that though the Archdeacon was convinced of the authority of the Church of England, and believed in her mission, yet he could not disguise from himself, that there were things in the Roman Church which he preferred. Mr. Gladstone, therefore, attributed the decided attitude of Archdeacon Manning to the result of the refusal of the Bishops to propagate a Declaration, that the Gorham Judgment was neither the law nor the faith of the Church of England.

How "the peril and the crisis," as he described the effects of the Gorham Judgment, affected Archdeacon Manning is best disclosed in letters, in which, without fear or restraint, he lays bare his heart, and speaks of his plans and intentions in the immediate future. His leaving Lavington is clearly indicated—it is the greatest trial to be faced—but he gives no hint of any thought or intention of submitting to the Catholic Church.

Nine months after the Gorham Judgment he writes in a letter dated—

Lavington, November 18th, 1850. (†)

Last Tuesday, I saw my Bishop and told him, that I should like to go away for the winter. Until I had seen him, I did not think it right to say positively, that such was my intention. But people have settled it for me and asked questions, and I find from —— that you had heard of it. You would never think, that I could keep anything from you. But it is hard to keep pace with the tongues of people My thought is to be in London, December 2nd, and to go, if I can, about the 5th., my first point would be to join Gladstone at Naples; and if Lean, I am hoping to go to Jerusalem I shall be glad to avoid

this winter, and if I am not at Lavington I had better be fairly away. Last winter in London I had no rest; and this year I have had no holiday Whether I be right or wrong in this great trial, which has come on the face of the land, He will know, that my heart's desire is to be faithful to Him and then all is well, Give my affectionate love to——

H. E. M.

In the meantime, whilst these attempts by Bishop Wilberforce, Archdeacon Harrison, Mr. Gladstone, and many others to patch up matters were going on, an event happened, which brought things to a crisis; what the condemnation of Tract 90; what Newman's conversion and Oakeley's and Ward's, and Dalgairens' and Faber's; what the appointment of Dr. Hampden; the Erastian compact with Prussia about the Jerusalem Bishopric, had not affected—for Manning's faith in the Anglican Church survived them all;* what not even the Gorham Judgment, however deeply it troubled his soul had, at any rate, not as yet accomplished, was effected by "Circumstance," not an unspiritual god; but in this case a divine minister of Grace. The Papal Bull, "given at St. Peter's, Rome, under the seal of the Fisherman," restoring the Catholic Hierarchy in England, and Wiseman's letter dated "from the Flaminian Gate," fell like a bolt from the blue. For, on the sudden, Lord John Russell, in his notorious Durham letter, raised not only a "No Popery" cry throughout the length and breadth of the land, but with malignant purpose directed ultra-Protestant suspicions and jealousies against the Tractarian Party. What Protestantism had most to fear and guard against, so ran the argument, was not the audacious assaults of "Popery," but "the danger within the gates from the unworthy sons of the Church herself." The madness spread like wildfire. It affected all sorts and conditions of men from the Prime Minister and the Lord Chancellor, down to the street-boy, who chalked up "No Popery" on the walls† There was a braying

* This is shown in a private letter, written, at this critical period, by Archdeacon Manning, in which, among many other things I cannot recite here, he says:—"When have I spoken or written a word about the Church of England in any spirit, but of love and reverence, or with any intention, but to serve it for Christ's sake?"

† *Punch* had a caricature of Lord John Russell as a street-boy chalking up "No Popery" on the wall, then running away.

of donkeys—for verily it was little else—from John-o'-Groat's to Land's End. There was a flutter in the dovecots—a flutter of voices and of petticoats from the Duchess in her Drawing-room to the Dairy-maid at the cow's udder. The milk of human kindness in that day of fanaticism was turned sour in too many an English home. Not only larky young stock-brokers, but grave, bald-headed bankers and brewers and business men made fools of themselves on Guy Fawkes Day, 1850, shouting like wild Indians, and dancing like chimney-sweeps on May-day, round the effigy of Cardinal Wiseman, in front of the Royal Exchange. Our generation, rubbing its eyes, marvels much at such a strange outbreak of fanaticism, not merely on the part of ministers of religion, or of politicians with an eye to business; but of otherwise sedate and sober men. The nation for a time went out of its wits; and you cannot put, as Lamartine, I think, said of France during the Reign of Terror, a whole people into a strait jacket.

In that day of excitement, of fierce and furious fanaticism and rampant bigotry, to steer a middle course was impossible for the most judicious of men or of Archdeacons. There was a broad line of demarcation drawn between Protestants and "Papists;" and Puseyites were just as much "Papists" in the popular eye as Catholics themselves, or worse: for they were denounced as wolves in sheep's clothing. Whoso did not shout with the shouting crowd was a Romanizer in disguise. There was no middle path, no half-way house, not even at Lavington.

At last the storm reached even the quiet precincts of Lavington and Chichester. There was no help for it; no escape. The Bishop of Chichester, Ashurst-Turner Gilbert, called upon the Archdeacon to convoke a "No Popery" meeting. Archdeacon Manning obeyed the bidding of his Bishop, but declared to his assembled brethren—to the poignant regret of all present, more especially of the Bishop—that his calling them together was his last ministerial act as Archdeacon. It was the beginning of the end. Before the close of that month of noontide madness—that Guy Fawkes month—when Cardinal Wiseman was burnt in effigy, Archdeacon Manning had made up his mind to resign his Archdiaconal office; and what was harder still, his beloved Living and home at Lavington.

The end is not far off. The event, ordained of God in the inscrutable counsels of Divine Wisdom, is at hand. For nigh upon twenty years, Saul of Tarsus had kicked against the goad in vain.

In that escoteric little chapel near the Buckingham Palace Road, where, in those days, the elect of the Tractarian Party took part in its dim, mystic services, or hung in rapture upon the lips of Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, Manning worshipped for the last time as an Anglican. Four or five years ago the Cardinal said, "Shall I tell you where I performed my last act of worship in the Church of England? It was in that little chapel off the Buckingham Palace Road. I was kneeling by the side of Mr. Gladstone. Just before the Communion Service commenced, I said to him 'I can no longer take the Communion in the Church of England.' I rose up—"St. Paul is at thy side"—and laying my hand on Mr. Gladstone's shoulder, said: 'Come.' It was the parting of the ways. Mr. Gladstone remained; and I went my way. Mr. Gladstone still remains where I left him."

The ways of God in bringing his elect into the Church are as various as they are wonderful. A few, like Saul of Tarsus, find salvation by a direct call: "a light from Heaven above the brightness of the sun; a voice speaking unto" them; some by process of argument and reasoning or of historical research; some by the study of Ecclesiastical Art or Mediæval Architecture; still more by the unconscious attraction of Divine truth; others by doubts and misgivings in the Church of their baptism; to others, again, the Divine call comes in the form of external circumstances: God speaks to their souls by acts done outside of themselves; by processes and energies working round about them for good or for ill.

As the toad that squatted at the ear of Eve was transformed by the touch of the Ithuriel-like spear of Truth; so was the Church of England forced by the Sword of Peter, in that day of turmoil and confusion, to show herself in her true colours as Protestant to the core, Protestant from the crown of her head to the sole of her feet: forced to speak by the mouth of her Bishops, Priests, and people, in her true voice. If, in accepting the Royal Supremacy imposed upon her by the Gorham Judgment, she showed herself as a bond-slave

of the State; on the other hand, in her denunciations and maledictions of the Catholic Church and of the Tractarian Party—"the unworthy sons," as she called them, in the words of Lord John Russell, "within her gates"—she spoke of her own free will; and after her kind; and out of the fulness of her heart. Walking in her liberty through the land—in all the wide domains that owned her sway—she comported herself as a Queen, oblivious, that she was not vested in the royal robes of the "King's daughter," but wore, as a bond-slave, the livery of the State. This unnatural mother disowned the children of her own womb, and cursed in that day of madness, or rather of self-betrayal, not only those, that had escaped from the "House of Bondage and the City of Confusion," but them, that were yet struggling in their bonds and striving after the freedom with which Christ had made them free. From the eyes of many in that day of rough awakening the scales fell; they fell at last from the eyes of one elected, for His divine purposes of God in the beginning of faith, and in the vision, the Church of England, by her own acts and words, stood revealed to him in her true nature. His now unsealed eyes saw, that she bore upon her the fatal note of "dry breasts and a miscarrying womb." And he knew now, in the opening of his eyes by the Hand of God, rough in its mercy, that for seventeen years and more he had sat a captive, not at the feet of the "King's Daughter," as he had vainly imagined, but at the feet of a Rebel-Queen, who had no right to the name or title she bore: no right or claim to the robes of the "King's Daughter": a Sorceress, that had cast her spells upon him, and had made him drink of her cup: held him captive, bound by her false wiles and charms, heart and soul, to her footstool, as Merlin was bound to his forest tree by the spells and wiles of Vivien.

The last stage in this long pilgrimage from Lavington to Rome had yet to be reached. His "last act of reason and his first act of faith" was in abjuring the claims of the Anglican church.* Another act had yet to be done; another wrench suffered; another break with his old life and Faith. Saul

* "The last act of reason is the first act of Faith," was a proposition which the Cardinal laid down in a private letter to Mr. Gladstone on Faith and Reason.

still kicked against the goad. Archdeacon Manning could not bring himself to believe, that he was not a priest. After five hours' discussion with the Rev. Mr. Tierney, at Arundel, on the validity of Anglican Orders, in which he believed, to use his own words, "with a consciousness stronger than all reasoning," the "late Archdeacon of Chichester," with eyes aflame, in one of those "Birseker rages" not very uncommon in Archdeacon Manning, and, perhaps, not altogether unknown in the Cardinal Archbishop—rose up and said : " Then you think me insincere." Never, I verily believe, since the days of Saul of Tarsus have any of the sons of men wrestled so obstinately, or so long with the Lord. Never was a nobler wrestling, if I may so speak, because of his implicit faith and trust in the Lord, more nobly consummated than by the absolute submission of his heart and soul to the Divine will.

One heart-wrench the more ; a last break with all the traditions of his life ; a last humiliation, terrible to such a nature as his—the confession to himself—that all his life long he had been only a simple layman ; and all was over. His hour is come ; God's battle is won : and the end is this : "I, Paul, a prisoner of the Lord."

EDMUND SHERIDAN PURCELL.

Science Notices.

The Frankfort Electrical Exhibition.—The late Frankfort Electrical Exhibition was by no means international in its exhibits. It was, however, thoroughly representative of the electrical enterprise of the German nation. A decidedly worthy feature of the exhibition was the representation of the work of the scientist as well as that of the practical engineer, an example which might well be imitated by the promoters of our own electrical exhibitions, which have hitherto been so purely commercial in their character.

At Frankfort various electrical experiments were shewn in action ; amongst them were Dr. Froelich's telephonic method of working Koenig's dancing flames from a distance. Perhaps the most interesting to electricians of these refined scientific exhibits were Dr. Froelich's method of determining electric current curves, especially those produced by alternating current dynamos, which will supply a need felt by electrical engineers. His apparatus is exceedingly simple. To the disc of a telephone there is attached a little mirror. Behind the disc is a horseshoe magnet, round whose soft iron pole piece is a coil carrying the current produced by an alternating current dynamo. The iron disc vibrates more or less under the action of the current, therefore, if a beam of light from an electric light is reflected from the little mirror on the vibrating disc on to a screen, there will be a vertical line of light on the screen. To obtain the current curve the beam is made to undergo a second reflection from a rotating mirror before reaching the screen. The rotating mirror gives a continuous horizontal line of light along the screen if there is no current flowing, and the combination of the vertical and horizontal motions of the beam gives the current curve of the particular current under examination. Dr. Froelich in practice has no less than twelve reflecting surfaces in his revolving mirror, so as to obtain the whole of the curve, and of such a size as can be easily photographed. The mirror is fixed to a gear-wheel driven off the spindle of a small alternating electric motor. When self-induction or mutual induction is added to the circuit, the current curve on the screen changes its shape, and interesting effects in this way are obtained.

The greatest attraction at the exhibition was undoubtedly the experiment of electrically transmitting the energy of a stream at

Lauffen to Frankfort—a distance of some 109 miles. This energy was utilised at the exhibition to light 1000 incandescent lamps, and to pump up water to form a huge artificial waterfall. This experiment, produced by the joint enterprise of the Allegemeine Electricitäts Gesellschaft of Berlin, and the Oerlikon Works of Zurich, is a gigantic stride in electrical application, and should prove an immediate stimulus to the civilization of such natural sources of energy as waterfalls, streams, and ebb and flow of the tide. The success of the experiment is due to the utilization of the transformer principle, by which the electrical pressure can be instantly changed from high to low, or *vice versa*. The currents travel for the 109 miles at a pressure of 18,000 volts, and when they reach their destination the pressure is lowered to 100 volts. Three bare copper wires, only 0·158 inch in thickness, and supported on ordinary telegraphic posts convey the electric energy. The only safety precautions being that the posts have upon them graphic representations of skeletons as a warning to trespassers. But it is inhuman to make death the penalty of a climb up the posts, as such might be undertaken by a thoughtless child—no wires conveying such dangerous currents should be insulated. It is estimated that some 110 horse power is utilised at the Frankfort exhibition, but doubtless before long the results of accurate tests of the actual power received will be forthcoming.

Besides containing so much of deep scientific interest, the exhibition did not fail to provide that lighter form of scientific entertainment which seems necessary for the popular success of such undertakings. There was the telephonic reproduction of the opera at Munich, 200 miles away. There was an electrical theatre designed to show the varied optical effects that can be produced by incandescent lamps, so arranged that brightness and colour can be regulated by the manipulation of a handle. The effects of sunrise, sunset, the alpine glow, were reproduced by this apparatus in a most novel manner.

The International Meteorological Conference.—This, the 11th of its kind, was held at Munich, from August 26th to September 2nd, and was of a private character, no Government support being given. In fact the Governments of Germany and Russia were averse to countenancing the objects of the conference. There were 32 members present, and English was mainly spoken, though German was the official language. Great Britain was represented by Mr. R. H. Scott, The United States by four members, Germany sent nine, France two, Russia three, Austria, Hungary, Roumania, and Bulgaria one each.

Methods of observation were considered, and the instruments for making same. With regard to the methods of observation, it was proposed that in cloud observation a limit should be fixed of the region observed to a certain zenith. The estimation of the total amount of cloud in the sky was discussed, likewise sunshine observation. A proposal to fix a universal zone time for meteorological work was vetoed on the score of impracticability.

In considering meteorological instruments, the anemometer received much attention. We can realise the importance of this portion of the conference, for the advance of our knowledge of wind measurement, when we remember that so lately as May, 1890, our Royal Meteorological Society directed experiments should be carried out simultaneously with various different instruments, stating that until this had been made, the Society could not recommend any mode of measurement. At the present time, our National Observatories carry out wind observations with rival instruments, with the object of testing their comparative value. The question arose of a uniform height above ground in anemometers for purpose of observation. The importance of *position* to Meteorological instruments is apparent, and to regulate any necessary alterations in same is, in Great Britain one of the main duties of the visiting Inspector of Stations. Dr. Sprung has lately pointed out in a German Journal that the perfectly open exposure of a thermometer screen is even harder to obtain than that of a rain-gauge. These two important instruments likewise received attention at the conference. A recommendation was made referring to standard thermometers, and it was urged that temperature should be referred to the Air thermometer.

Various rain gauges have been made, and the late exhibition by the Royal Meteorological Society of this class of instrument, showed to the London scientific world how great the variety still in use throughout the various countries. In considering the rain gauge the conference came to a decision that, acted on, would lead in this country at least to a large registration of days on which rain falls; the definition of the rain gauge was lowered, and a record of every 4-100th of an inch was required. The conference likewise gave advice on the placing of rain-gauges on roofs. As regards radiation records no special actinometer was recommended for general adoption.

The New Star in the Milky Way.—The present century has been exceptionally favoured with stellar apparitions. No less than six have occurred since Hind's star shone out in Ophiuchus in 1848;

while the greater part of two previous centuries had been, in this respect, a blank. Tycho Brahe, however, in 1572, and Kepler in 1604, had each the opportunity of observing the evanescent splendour of an object nearly equalling Venus at her brightest; and Hipparchus, according to the statement of Pliny, derived from a similar outburst the impulse for the construction of his famous star-catalogue. There have been a good many besides; about a score, in fact, are credibly recorded; and it is remarkable that almost all have made their transient appearance within the zone of the Milky Way. It is then unmistakably evident that the conditions prevailing in that great ring-shaped aggregation are such as to favour conflagrations on the portentous scale of that which we have been recently witnessing.

New stars are not, like comets, visitors to our skies. They are at immeasurable distances, and their real motions, however rapid, hence make no difference in their positions as seen from the earth. That is to say, they *appear* perfectly stationary. Each outburst represents then a genuine blaze, a sudden development of light in a previously dim body. But as to the means by which such developments are brought about, nothing certain can be said. It is exceedingly unlikely that they can be due, as some have thought, to actual collisions. Perhaps the true explanation may be found in some kind of electrical action between cosmical masses in swift relative motion, of the nature of that exemplified, on a smaller scale, in cometary phenomena.

Our latest "guest-star," to use a Chinese expression, is situated in the southern part of the constellation Auriga, just where the celestial charioteer dips his feet into the stream of the Milky Way. Its arrival was signified, on the 1st of February, to Dr. Copeland, the Scottish Astronomer-royal, by means of an anonymous post-card, the writer of which has since turned out to be Mr. Thomas Anderson, a citizen of the good town of Edinburgh, modestly devoted to astronomical pursuits. He had noticed the object probably for a week before the novelty of its character forced itself upon his attention, and a cablegram from America announced, a few days subsequently to the publication of his discovery, that it had been three times during the month of December photographed at Harvard College, where star-charting operations on a great scale are carried on under the direction of Professor Pickering. There its history seems to begin. No existing catalogue includes the strange object; no record affirms its existence, which must accordingly have been of the obscure sort belonging to stars below the ninth or tenth magnitude.

of brightness. It would have been impossible to pick it out from the undistinguished multitude of the stellar host, as destined to future celebrity ; yet, in the early days of February, its radiance had increased, at any rate, one hundred times, and the attention of astronomers in all parts of the northern hemisphere was riveted by the extraordinary peculiarities disclosed through the analysis of its light. For it not only showed the characteristic blazing spectrum of a "Nova," but the bright lines freely distributed from end to end of the coloured band unrolled out of its telescopic image by the dispersing effect of the prism, proved to be doubled by dark ones. Now the contrasted members of these pairs of lines undoubtedly originated from the radiations of the same substances, the most conspicuous and readily identifiable being due respectively to hydrogen and sodium ; but they were not exactly in their usual places. The dark lines, in fact, were all without exception pushed a little towards the blue end of the spectrum, while the bright companions deviated still more noticeably towards the red. Such changes of position are a well-known result of end-on movement in luminous bodies ; but here the movements indicated were in opposite directions, the dark lines asserting rapid approach to the earth, the bright lines, on the contrary, betraying an extraordinary velocity of recession. Only one explanation was possible. The apparent contradiction could not be reconciled otherwise than by the supposition that the new star in Auriga was in reality made up of two separate bodies rushing past each other at a tremendous speed. They differed, moreover, very greatly in constitution. The body emitting the bright lines was largely gaseous ; the adjacent globe seemed to possess a more strictly sun-like nature. The former claims the higher velocity. It is retreating at the unparalleled rate of 420 miles a second, the latter, meanwhile, advancing at about 300. This gives, by Dr. Vogel's "spectrographic" measurements, a speed of separation of seven hundred and twenty miles a second ! With each day that passes, in other words, this singular pair of stars are increasing their mutual distance by sixty-two millions of miles ; and there is yet no sign of slackening. The tell-tale lines show no marked tendency to coalesce as the temporary brightness of the combined object has waned. Yet gravitating masses could not make so close an approach to each other as these two have evidently done, without describing some kind of orbit round one another. And orbital motion should, under the circumstances, change very rapidly in rate, as well as most probably in direction. Hence we seem compelled to suppose that it constitutes only an insignificant part of the total velocity. For the decision of

this point, however, the results of further investigations must be awaited.

The star of 1892 is the first Nova which has been investigated by the aid of the camera. Autographic records of it have been obtained, both simple and prismatic, through the means of reflectors and refractors, with short and with long exposures. Photographs of its spectrum have been taken by Father Sidgreaves at Stonyhurst, by Mr. Lockyer at South Kensington, by Dr. Vogel at Potsdam, and, the best of all, by Dr. and Mrs. Huggins at Tulse Hill. The last shows an extraordinarily long range of invisible, ultra-violet rays, such as could only be emitted by a body at a very high temperature. The glow of this marvellous object, indeed, is of an actinic intensity comparable to that possessed by the brilliant rays of Sirius. Nevertheless, it is not a white star. It shines with a distinct and unvarying pale yellow colour. It is not, however, hazy or indistinct. The best observers are unanimous in declaring that the straw-tinted beams charged with such wonderful implicit revelations, proceed from a sharp stellar point exempt from the least suspicion of nebulous affinities. Emphatic testimony to this effect is derived from a photograph to which Mr. Roberts gave a long exposure for the special purpose of bringing out possible lurking symptoms of cosmical haze in the vicinity of the Nova. None were found to exist.

Lunar Photography.—The moon-pictures obtained by De La Rue, Rutherford, and other pioneers in that line, were full of a promise which long remained unfulfilled. Now however at last, after a standstill of a quarter of a century, lunar photography seems to have entered upon a period of steady advance. That this should sooner or later come to pass, was indeed inevitable. The vast improvements made in other branches of the art of chemical delineation as applied to the heavenly bodies, could not fail eventually to extend to that concerned with our satellite. Excellent results have accordingly been secured both at the Lick observatory and at Paris by the adoption of the novel plan of piecemeal portraiture. Detailed representations of particular districts are substituted for general views of the lunar surface. The chartographic scale, in fact, has been greatly enlarged, the lunar scenery being faithfully reproduced bit by bit, under varied conditions of illumination. The records thus accumulated will beyond doubt prove of inestimable value to future selenographers, desirous of tracing back the history, and testing the imputed fluctuations, of the rugged features of our celestial consort.

Nevertheless, no single photograph, however perfect, can adequately portray so much as one lunar crater. For the actinic power of the surface varies so much even within the same restricted area, that fine gradations of exposure are needed to bring out all the heights and hollows and inequalities of level perceptible with a good telescope. A series of photographs, accordingly, taken, some almost instantaneously, others in progressively augmented times, would be required for the registration of the diversified effects of light and shade in any given formation. Crater-pits and rills, dark terrace-lines along lighter walls, summits of dazzling brilliancy, dull plains, obscure chasms, all claim slightly different intervals for self-disclosure; and a perfect picture can thus only be produced by the combination of many designedly partial ones. This has been well pointed out by Professor Weinek, of Prague, who has undertaken the minute study of the Lick negatives. But although these have been taken with what may be called *average* exposures, each of them furnishes, in the words of the same authority, "a wonderfully beautiful relief of considerable expanse, which can never be retained and depicted with equal truth to nature by the most skilful draughtsman, on account of the great mass of visible objects and the rapid change of lunar shadows; and at the same time it gives an astonishingly accurate detail of individual portions, which for the control and revision of present lunar charts becomes of the utmost value to the selenographer."

The results of Professor Weinek's photographic studies are embodied in sets of beautiful drawings which will shortly be published. The lavish care bestowed upon them can be no better illustrated than by the statement that a single crater usually engages from forty to fifty hours of arduous toil. It is interesting to learn that he finds it necessary, for the purpose of showing the full amount of detail contained in the best negatives, to use a twenty-fold enlargement in the corresponding drawings. This is equivalent to the application, in the viewing telescope, of a magnifying power of one thousand times; in other words, the diameter of the full moon would, on the same scale of delineation, exceed nine feet. One important fruit of the scrutiny so diligently carried on at Prague, is the discovery of a new crater connected with an extensive system of "rills," none of them previously noted. The fissures named by Schröter "rills," form a curious feature in lunar topography. They are some hundreds of yards deep, and sometimes run to a length of a hundred or a hundred and fifty miles. But as to their origin and meaning nothing is certainly known. Some consider them to be

cracks produced during the cooling of a hardened crust; in the opinion of others they represent dried-up watercourses. Their obvious volcanic relations are not, however, favourable to the latter view. Thus, we learn from Professor Holden that "Professor Weinek's new crater lies at the intersection of two of these rills, some of which are formed of confluent craters." No river or stream could ever, one would think, have followed a bed so constituted.

One of the splendid lunar photographs taken by the Brothers Henry at the Paris observatory is reproduced in *Knowledge* for March, 1892. The instrument employed was a photographic refractor thirteen inches in aperture, the image at the principal focus of which was, by the use of magnifying lenses, enlarged fifteen times before being received on the sensitive plate. The resulting impression delineates accordingly a small part of a disc one metre in diameter. Neither in this, nor in any other lunar photograph, can the slightest trace of an atmosphere be detected. The definition is as sharp towards the edges, as at the centre of the disc. No veil, however tenuous, of air or vapour is anywhere perceptibly interposed. Modern researches have indeed reduced to a minimum the outstanding possibility left for the existence of a lunar atmosphere. Their results are, at most, compatible with the presence of an evanescent remnant of an appurtenance which must, nevertheless, we should suppose, have once played its part in the economy of our dependant globe.

A Great Sunspot.—The largest group of spots ever photographed at Greenwich emerged to view, at the eastern edge of the sun's disc, on the 5th of last February. Six days later it was centrally situated, and on the 18th it vanished, carried out of sight by the rotation of the great globe torn and stained by it in its shining surface. Its appearance, when in full view, was described by Miss E. Brown, in a paper read before the British Astronomical Association, as most imposing. The principal nucleus was twofold, and displayed a wide encircling border of penumbra, or half-shade; and a congeries of satellite-spots strewn around it covered an area about 150,000 miles in length by 75,000 in width. No less, in fact, than $\frac{3}{10}$ of the sun's visible hemisphere was affected by this tremendous disturbance, which, in any of its numerous minor foci, could have engulfed our little earth with as little concern as the Dragon of Wantley displayed when he

Swallowed the mayor, asleep in his chair,
one memorable Sunday morning at church. Safeguarded as

it was by distance against such a catastrophe, our planet was nevertheless far from insensible to the agitation of its master-orb. A violent magnetic disturbance prevailed in Europe and America on the 13th and 14th of February ; electric wires were so fully occupied in carrying earth-currents as to be with difficulty available for the transmission of telegraphic and telephonic messages ; and the skies were lit up at night with one of the most brilliant auroral displays of recent years. The characteristic luminous arch does not appear to have been seen in this country, but a crimson patch to the west of north formed the basis from which yellowish streamers flickered and leaped up to within thirty degrees of the zenith. Some attempts at spectral observations on the phenomenon made by Mr. Common at Ealing, were frustrated by the brightness of the moon.

Artificial Rain-making.—Of all the attempts of modern science perhaps that which at first view seems most audacious is the effort to control the weather. Such an attempt is embodied in the so-called rain-making experiments in Texas of this autumn, and in England Lord Rayleigh's electrical experiments on drops of water, Mr. Shelford Bidwell's electrified jet of steam, and Dr. Oliver Lodge's investigation into the action of electricity on dust and fog have been indirect but preparatory steps to any such undertaking. In Texas it was endeavoured to produce rain by explosion. The original idea seems to have been the explosion of small balloons of about ten feet diameter, and filled with a mixture of hydrogen and oxygen in the ratio of two to one. Preparations were also made to fire sticks of dynamite on kites, but in practice the experimenters seem to have encountered difficulties with the balloons and kites, and to have abandoned them. The only explosions that were at all systematically carried out were those produced by firing rackarock. It seems to be a general opinion that the explosion is the direct cause of precipitation of rain, but it seems that explosion is only the indirect cause. An upward movement of the air currents seems to be the natural process preceding rainfall. In ascending the air becomes under diminished pressure more and more saturated until it condenses its surplus vapour in the form of rain. The explosion starts the small upward movement, of itself seemingly incapable of producing rain, but if the atmosphere is in the unstable condition which will continue and intensify the upward movement, rain must certainly ensue. To increase our knowledge of the instability of the state of the atmosphere in respect of its humidity and its rate of vertical temperative decrement would be a

desirable preliminary step for rain-making experiments. Data might be supplied by observations taken with captive balloons provided with self-recording instruments. In these rain-making experiments it is difficult to tell whether the actual rainfall following the explosion is the consequence of the explosion or only the usual operations of nature. In fact the experimenters at Texas seem to think their experiments last summer have been anything but conclusive—even on the occasion of the last experiment on August 25th—when the condition to the casual observer seemed unfavourable for rain, and the results of the firing seemed to have produced an artificial thunderstorm, it appears that rain had been forecasted from Washington for the actual scene of operations. It is evident that before any conclusions can be arrived at there will need to be a prolonged series of experiments under every condition of atmosphere. As regards the proposed electrical precipitation of rain there is certainly a field for investigation. It seems pretty certain that electrical action produces a coalescence of drops of water. If, as Lord Rayleigh has shown, a stick of sealing wax that has been rubbed is held near a fountain jet, the fine spray instantly coalesces into large drops. Mr. Shelford Bidwell has varied this experiment by throwing the shadow of a jet of steam upon a screen. Under ordinary conditions the shadow of the jet appears of slight intensity and of neutral tint, but when the jet is electrified the shadow of the jet becomes much clearer, having an orange brown appearance. It is clear that in this case coalescence of the drops takes place. Dr. Oliver Lodge has successfully dissipated miniature fogs and fumes under glass receivers by electrical discharges, and in 1886 he said, in an address given on one of the Friday evening meetings at the Royal Institution, "This much I regard as certain that if a kite or captive balloon (a kite for windy days, and a balloon for calm ones) be flown into a cloud and made to give off electricity for some time that cloud will begin to rain. It is just possible that by the automatic coalescence of drops into larger ones the potential of the charge so given would be high enough to cause an artificial thunderstorm." If true results are practically realised it will be fascinating work for the farmer to prematurely tap the clouds as they pass over his dried-up meadows, but it is doubtful whether they would benefit the world at large. If rain is artificially produced in one place another locality will be robbed of what would have been its natural right.

The Exclusion of Dust.—Dr. Pridgin Teale, whose efforts to produce a smoke-reducing grate have been certainly successful, has

recently made investigations to ascertain the means by which dust can be excluded from our houses, and especially from bookcases, cupboards, and other receptacles wherein are placed valuable articles, which are generally exposed to its ravages. Dr. Pridgin Teale maintains that the air which is admitted into our rooms, and which forces itself into our receptacles, must be filtered. This process will need a revolution in our windows. He insists that the window should be air-tight, and that the necessary air for maintaining the ventilation of the apartment and for supplying the fire should be admitted through a series of small jets near the ceiling. To shut out soot and other dust the air is to be filtered by a canvas screen, placed diagonally in a flat tube leading up to the jets. In the model window, plate glass and the window sash is abolished. Dr. Pridgin Teale disapproves of the plate glass, on the grounds that a large surface of glass chills the air of the room, and thus induces cold currents in the room, which have not the advantage of being fresh air. His window is divided so that one-half vertically, and in a large window one-third, opens inwards on hinges ; the other half, or two-thirds, being fixed, and therefore air-tight. The hinged window is so constructed that when closed the framework of the window locks into a double rebated fast frame, after the manner of a jeweller's show case. Each pane is doubled, a second pane being placed inside the ordinary pane at a distance of five-eighths of an inch. The outside pane is fixed with putty in the ordinary way, but the inner pane is held in its place by two small nails. Thus it can be easily removed, if it is necessary, to clean the inside window, but the necessity of cleaning the inside window is avoided by facing the flange against which the pane is pressed with cotton velvet. The air which passes between the panes is thus filtered of its dust. It is, however, extremely doubtful whether such a window would find any favour in an ordinary house. In most houses, during a large portion of the year, the windows are open throughout the day. In a city a quantity of dust must enter the windows with the air. During the summer months a dust-tight window would not be of much value, since its advantages would not be made use of. No arrangement of filtering air tubes would compensate for the closed window in the dog days. As regards the material for dust filters, Dr. Pridgin Teale has by experiment come to the conclusion that dommette flannel and cotton wool are the best medium. Screens of such material should, he advises, be provided for bookcases, chests of drawers, and cupboards. A bookcase with a glass front should have no solid wooden back, but for it flannel should be substituted,

being loosely fixed over the skeleton frame. If the workmanship of the bookcase is very perfect, and if velvet is provided at every place where the edges of the doors come into contact with their frame, Dr. Pridgin Teale thinks that a much smaller area of filter, perhaps even a tube filled with cotton wool, would suffice. For cupboards he would substitute flannel screens for every panel. In the case of chests of drawers the ordinary back is to be made of flannel, and the front of the drawers may be perforated with holes and a filter placed on the inner surface of the front of the drawer. But even these latter suggestions are not very likely to find favour in a domestic establishment. A cupboard with panels of flannel is suggestive of an ugliness perhaps more intolerable to a fine æsthetic sense than the dust we would exclude. It is rather with the curators of public libraries and museums that Dr. Pridgin Teale's suggestions will obtain consideration. It is the duty of a curator to preserve to the utmost the public property entrusted to his care from the devastating influence of dirt and soot, and there should be every effort to make the cases which contain the nation's priceless treasures dust-proof.

The Crystal Palace Electrical Exhibition.—The exhibition, opened at the Crystal Palace at the beginning of this year, cannot be said to be so thoroughly representative of the electrical industry of the British nation, as was the Frankfort Exhibition of the German. It is, however, on a scale of sufficient magnitude to show the vast progress that has been made in electrical contrivances since the exhibition held ten years ago in the same building. At that time the attainment of practical electric light was a novelty, and the exhibition of 1881 was remarkable for the uncontrolled glare which was effused from every available corner of the buildings. At that time every company possessed its own type of incandescent lamp, and each vied with the other in the attempt to outdo in the luminosity of their exhibit. Since that time a long and tedious process of litigation has placed the monopoly of incandescent lamp manufacture in the hands of one company who, in the present exhibition, have raised a memorial of their victories in a huge screen of 5,000 lamps. The Edison-Swan lamp exhibit is certainly remarkable in showing the variety of form in which the lamp can be made. They exhibit lamps differing in candle power from a fraction of a candle to 2,000 candles. In size of vacuum globe they vary from less than half an inch in diameter to nine and a half inches. Some lamps are pear shaped, others tubular, others conical, others twisted—in fact the vacuum bulb can be blown into any

conceivable shape to suit the fancy of the consumer. The chief feature of the exhibition is the manner in which the electric light is subdued for the requirements of domestic use. It is essentially an exhibition of electric fittings and lamp shades, which are well-nigh brought to perfection. In no exhibit is there any obtrusive glare. In some the light is moderated by the vacuum globe being made of ground or opal glass, or tinted various colours, in others the light is screened by shades of numerous materials and hues. The display in the Entertainment court is a beautiful specimen of the controlled effulgence of electric lighting. An interesting exhibition is afforded by Messrs. Siemens who perform experiments before an audience with an electro-motive force of 50,000 volts. Only a few months ago it seemed a marvellous feat to handle 18,000 volts. Messrs. Siemens have now more than doubled that number. The high pressure thus represented is not used as were the 18,000 volts at Frankfort, for any transmission of power to a distance, but simply to convince the public of the ease with which currents of low intensity can be transformed into those of high pressure. The electric discharge produced by this high voltage on a glass plate is an experiment which cannot fail to make the spectators realize the power that is present. A striking experiment is the "Arc" produced by the current of 50,000 volts; when the carbon points are separated a flame leaps up from each point to the height of more than one foot. To prove that the voltage used in these experiments is really 50,000 volts, the current is sent through 500 incandescent lamps joined up in series, each of these lamps requires 100 volts to light it, therefore the 500 lamps could not be lit if the 50,000 volts was not reached. There are some very neat contrivances in the way of heating by electricity to be seen at the Exhibition. There are kettles and saucepans which contain the heating apparatus within them, and the utensil has only to be connected to the electrical circuit. At present it is a somewhat expensive process to use electricity for heating, but the facility with which those who have electric energy laid on to their houses can thus apply it will entice many to commit the extravagance.

Notes of Travel and Exploration.

Captain Younghusband's Journey in the Pamirs.—The mountainous region lying to the north of Kashmir was the subject of Captain Younghusband's interesting address to the Royal Geographical Society on Monday evening, February 8th. The title of the "Roof of the World," bestowed on these plateaus, is fully justified by the height, vastness and grandeur of their mountains, which seemed to him to render it the culminating point of Western Asia. Desolate as is the country, it yet contains secluded valleys where hardy hillmen till the ground and form villages. Among the most remote of these is a little State, called Hunza by its neighbours on the southern, and Kanjut on the northern side of the passes, which long withstood the tides of conquest eddying round it. Some theorists see in this little valley, whose chiefs claim descent from Alexander the Great, the cradle of the formidable Hun race. An unusually daring attack by these freebooters on a caravan from Yarkand to Kashmir attracted the attention of the British authorities, and induced Captain Younghusband in the summer of 1889 to start from Kashmir to the point where the raid was committed, intending to travel back to India by way of Gilgit. Leaving Abbotabad on July 11th, with an escort of six men of the 5th Ghoorkas, he arrived on the 31st at Leh, where the final arrangements were made, and left it on August 8th. The first objective point—Shahidula—to reach which four passes ranging from 17,500 to 18,500 feet high had to be crossed, was attained on August 21st, and hence, after a fortnight spent in collecting supplies, a fresh start was made to explore the country up to the Tagh-dum-dash Pamir through the valley of Khal Chuskin, described as containing very fine scenery. From a depression in the range known as the Aghil Pass, a magnificent view was obtained, huge mountains rising up in a succession of sharp needle-like peaks, with the great ice-ranges in the background. Most perilous was the exploration of the glaciers in which the Oprang river takes its rise, as may be judged from the following description.

A Perilous Passage.—“ We were making towards a ravine up which we thought was the only possible way to the top of the pass, and were rounding an icy slope forming one side of the ravine, when suddenly we heard a report like thunder, and then a rushing sound.

We knew at once that it was an avalanche ; it was coming from straight above us, and I felt in that moment greater fear than I ever yet have done, for we could see nothing, but only heard this tremendous rushing sound coming down upon us. One of the men called out to run, but we could not do so, for we were on an ice-slope, up which we were hewing our way with an axe. The sound came nearer and nearer, then came a cloud of snow-dust, and the avalanche rushed past in the ravine by our side. We now continued the ascent of the ice-slope, hoping we might find a road by that way, but were brought up by a great rent in the ice, a yawning chasm of considerable width, with perpendicular walls of solid ice, which effectually put an end to our attempt to cross the pass. We therefore were obliged to return and give up all hopes of reaching the top,—the highest point we reached being just over 17,000 feet. On our way back we saw another avalanche rush down the mountain side and over the very path we had made in ascending, covering up our actual footsteps made in the snow, and very thankful I was when we again reached the open glacier out of the reach of avalanches."

Vast Mountains and Glaciers.—Some of the peaks seen here in the main Mustagh or western range reached heights of from 24,000 to 28,000 feet, and gave rise to glaciers on a corresponding scale, one of them many miles in length, and half a mile in width. The Taghdum-Dash Pamir was reached by a comparatively easy pass 14,600 feet high, and here a more open country was found expanding into wider valleys girt with snow mountains but covered with grass. This plateau was swept by a bleak wind which rendered the cold more intolerable than at higher altitudes. On leaving the Tagh-dum-Dash Pamir, the name of which signifies "the supreme head of the mountains," Captain Younghusband entered the Hunza territory and was well received by the chief, Safder Ali Khan, a fair-complexioned man with reddish hair and a European cast of face. Having a few years ago murdered his father, poisoned his mother, and thrown his two brothers over precipices, he described his deeds in the following terms to his suzerain, the Maharajah of Kashmir : "By the grace of God and the decree of fate my father and I fell out. I took the initiative and settled the matter and placed myself on the throne of my ancestors." The grandeur of the scenery here may be judged from the statement that there are in Hunza more peaks over 20,000 feet high than in the Alps over 10,000, while some reach the height of 25,000.

A Russian Traveller in India.—An interview at Lahore with the Russian traveller, Prince Galitsin, is reported in the Indian [No. 2 of Fourth Series.]

papers. He reached India from Turkestan *via* the Karokorum Pass and Kashmir, and the object of his visit is, as he says, to demonstrate to the people of Russian Turkestan by his own example the friendly relations between England and Russia, showing how a Russian gentleman, travelling without political motive, in his private capacity, and duly authorised by the British representative, is received with all courtesy and kindness. He also desires by a series of letters on India to correct the misunderstanding prevailing as to that country, about which there are only three books in Russian, all giving but an imperfect account of it. The two first, by M. Notovich and M. Bonvalot, deal only with the approach to India from the north, by the Karakorum Pass and the Pamirs respectively, the third by Mdme. Blavatsky, treats entirely of her special subject, the Buddhist religion. The people of Russia, said the Prince, know nothing of India, and his purpose is to teach them that it is not a single country like Spain or France, with a common nationality and language, but an aggregate of countries like Europe, containing many different races and tongues. He intends to describe the method of government in India, its finance and army, with the system of education in use, showing how great has been the progress of civilisation under British rule. This, speaking as a Russian patriot, he considers most important for the people of his own country. The successful termination of his journey was in great part due to the friendly assistance he received in critical circumstances from the British Political Department. Having left Turkestan with his attendants and twelve ponies on August 10th, he reached Kashgar on the 28th, Yarkand on September 18th, and crossed the Karakorum Pass on October 1st. Two days after a serious mishap befel him in the death, during the night, of nine of his ponies, it was supposed, from eating poisonous grasses, and he was much embarrassed as to how he was to continue his journey, until relieved from his difficulties on the following day by the arrival in camp of five Tibetan servants with three yaks, sent by Captain Evans Gordon for his use.

Travels in Rural Russia.—Mr. Stevens* is one of those modern travellers who seek to add to the interest of their journey by the adoption of some strange and novel means of locomotion. Having circumambulated the globe on a bicycle, he has now traversed southern Russia from Moscow to the Crimea on a mustang, an animal which was, however, of Hungarian, not Transatlantic origin. His steed figures only to a very limited extent on his pages, which contain instead, very detailed, and seemingly unbiased

* Through Russia on a Mustang. By Thomas Stevens. London : Cassell, 1891

accounts of rural Russia. A visit to a village seventy miles from Petersburg enabled him to gain some insight into the working of the much vaunted system of Russian local government. Each little commune is, as all the world knows, autonomous, governing itself on the most approved democratic principles by an elective parliament or "mir." Here is the description given by the blacksmith as spokesman for the community, of the result as regards the burning question of taxation, the great grievance of the land-owning peasantry.

"So the Government taxes you pretty heavily, does it?" asked the author.

"No, no," was the reply, "the government gets but very little of it. If the government knew all that happens to the moujik, it would pity him. The government taxes the mir and the mir taxes the individual. The elders collect the taxes and go off to Novgorod and drink vodka and eat caviar with the Novgorod officials, then come back and demand more taxes. It would be much better for us all if the Czar could sweep away everybody that stands between the Imperial Government and the people, and have no elders, no officers of any kind. The more officials who have the handling of our taxes and the management of our affairs, the worse for us."

"But the mir has the election of its own officers. If the present starosta (mayor) and the elders are dishonest and grasping, why don't you elect honest men like the blacksmith there, in their places?"

"The blacksmith does not know how to read and write (they laughed, how could he be mayor (starosta)? We have tried to remedy matters, but the educated people are too sharp for us; they always manage to keep in office whenever they choose and the wisest moujik keeps his mouth shut closest. The elders assess each one of us the amount of taxes he has to pay, the amount of work to be done on the roads without pay, and have the regulation of everything in the mir. If I am their friend they take care that my share of the taxes shall be light, and my work on the roads easy, and when the Czar demands soldiers they will pass by my son and pick out the son of a moujik who has made himself objectionable to them by grumbling and by voting against them at the elections. There are moujiks in the mir who pay next to no taxes at all, and moujiks who have to work away from home like batraks, besides tilling their land to get money enough to pay the taxes. It is the same in nearly every mir. If every man had a good heart the mires would be happy and prosperous, the moujiks well fed and clad, and our taxes would be light and easily paid. But every mir is a house of intrigue, in which the moujik is, in one way or another, cheated out of most of his earnings."

Not only taxation, but the administration of justice is in the hands of the elders of the mir, who form peasant courts to try all minor causes, both civil and criminal. In this capacity they are no less partial than in that of tax-gatherers, and the inhabitants would infinitely prefer to have causes tried by an officer of the Imperial Government, a reform which was talked of and anxiously anticipated. Among the powers of the village parliament is that of sentencing

to exile to Siberia the persistently worthless members of the community, hopeless drunkards, rogues, or criminals. The Chief of Police of the district, containing a population of about 50,000, told the author that the average number of such convicts sent from that area was five a year, while none were political offenders. It is evident that a formidable engine of local tyranny is here placed at the disposal of the village despots. Sentence of exile does not, however, in the majority of cases entail imprisonment, but merely residence like that of convicts on ticket-of-leave under a certain amount of police supervision, the exiles being free to live in the towns by their trades or professions, or to cultivate allotments of land as peasant occupiers.

Mr. Stevens, who travelled greater part of the way with a Russian companion, was only on one or two occasions molested by the police, although neither of them had the legal documents authorising their tour. Their adventures included a visit to Nijni Novgorod during the great fair, of which an interesting and detailed description is given.

The Earthquakes in Japan.—The *Times* of December 8th contains two letters from correspondents in Tokio, giving full details of the terrible shock which convulsed Central Japan on the morning of October 28th. The wave of disturbance traversed thirty-one provinces, an area equal to that of England, over which the earth's crust was violently shaken for ten minutes together, while slighter shocks were felt for a distance of 400 miles to the north, and travelled under the sea to a like distance, making themselves felt in a neighbouring island. In Tokio itself, though 170 miles from the centre of disturbance, it produced an earthquake greater than any felt for nearly forty years, lasting twelve minutes, with a maximum horizontal movement of 2 inches combined with a vertical one of $\frac{3}{8}$ ths of an inch. Owing, however, to the character of the movement which was a comparatively slow oscillation, the damage was confined to the wrecking of some roofs and chimneys. Very different were its results in the central zone of agitation, as to which the correspondent writes as follows:—

There was a noise as of underground artillery, a shake, a second shake, and in less than 30 seconds the Nagoya-Gifu Plain, covering an area of 1,200 square miles, became a sea of waves, more than 40,000 houses fell, and 7,000 people lost their lives. The sequence of events was approximately as follows: To commence at Tokio, the capital, which is some 200 miles from the scene of the disaster, on October 28th, at 6-38 a.m., the inhabitants were alarmed by a long easy swaying of the ground, and many sought refuge outside their doors. There were no shocks, but the

ground moved back and forth, swung round and round, and rose and fell with the easy gentle motion of a raft upon an ocean swell. Many became dizzy, and some were seized with nausea.

These indications, together with the movements of the seismographs, denoted a disturbance at a considerable distance, but the first surmise, that it was located under the Pacific Ocean, was unfortunately incorrect. The scene of the catastrophe was indicated only by tidings from its outskirts, as all direct news was cut off by the interruption of railway and telegraphic communication. An exploratory and relief party started on the second day from Tokio, not knowing how far they would be able to proceed by train, and the correspondent who accompanied them describes his experience as follows :—

SCENES OF DEVASTATION.

Leaving Tokio by a night train, early next morning we were at Hamamatsu, 137 miles distant from Tokio on the outside edge of the destructive area. Here, although the motion had been sufficiently severe to destroy some small warehouses, to displace the posts supporting the heavy roof of a temple, and to ruffle a few tiles along the eaves of houses, nothing serious had occurred. At one point, owing to the lateral spreading of an embankment there has been a slight sinkage of the line, and we had to proceed with caution. Crossing the entrance to the beautiful lake of Hamana Ko, which tradition says was joined to the sea by the breaking of a sand-spit by the sea waves accompanying the earthquake of 1498, we rise from the rice fields and pass over a country of hill and rock. Further along the line signs of violent movement became more numerous. Huge stone lanterns at the entrance to temples had been rotated or overturned, roofs had lost their tiles, especially along the ridge, sinkages in the line became numerous, and although there was yet another rock barrier between us and the plain of great destruction, it was evident that we were in an area where earth movements had been violent.

The theatre of maximum destruction was a plain dotted with villages and homesteads, supporting, under the garden-like culture of Japan, 500 to 800 inhabitants to the square mile, and containing two cities, Nagoya and Gifu, with populations respectively of 162,000 and 30,000, giving probably a round total of half a million of human beings. Within about twelve miles of the latter, a subsidence on a vast scale is said to have taken place, engulfing a whole range of hills or mountains, while over lesser areas the soil has in many places slipped down, carrying with it dwellings and their inmates. Gifu is a total wreck, devastated by ruin and conflagration, causing the destruction of half its houses. Ogaki, nine miles to the west, has fared worse, for here only 113 out of 4,434 houses remain standing, and a tenth of the population have been killed or wounded. In one temple where service was being

celebrated, the entire congregation except two perished. Nagoya too suffered heavily, and thousands of houses collapsed. The damage here was produced by three violent shocks in quick succession, preceded by a deep booming sound. During the succeeding 206 hours 6,600 earth spasms of greater or less intensity were felt at increasing intervals, occurring in the beginning probably at the rate of one a minute. The inhabitants were driven to bivouac in rude shelters in the streets for a full week at least, but seemed more cheerful than could have been expected in their sad circumstances. Some estimates place the figure of the killed or injured as high as 24,000, whilst at least 300,000 have been rendered homeless.

A New Industry in Argentina.—The British Consul at Buenos Ayres describes in a Foreign Office report, a new salt industry in the Argentine Republic. The extensive deposits of the mineral existing throughout the country are in most cases too far from a seaport to be profitably worked, but the vast lakes or *salinas* in the Rio Negro Valley are an exception, as they are within 22 miles of the harbour of San Blas. They are four in number, with a salt bearing area of 20,000 acres, the brine being 15ft. below the level of the sea at San Blas. The supply is supposed to be drawn from the mountains of rock salt exposed to the influence of the air at the foot of the Andes over 250 leagues distant. The brine is singularly strong, its density being thirty times that of the sea water at San Blas. The surface of the *salinas* is covered with water supplied by natural springs. The climate is favourable for the production of salt, the rainfall being small, and the sun and strong drying winds soon convert a vast sheet of water into a white expanse of salt from two to three inches thick, beneath which is a bed of salt mixed in nearly equal proportions with sand. The season for its extraction is from November to March, when it is gathered into small heaps and then piled in larger ones on the adjoining banks to await its removal on shipboard. A company has recently been formed under a concession from the province of Buenos Ayres to work these *salinas*, and is now bringing into the market large supplies of salt, suitable both for manufacturing and for household purposes. The quantity can be indefinitely increased with enlarged appliances, and the proprietors hope soon to be able to supply Uruguay and Brazil as well as the Argentine Republic. About 2,000 tons of English salt are now imported during the year, paying an import duty of 25 per cent on the value. The proportion of

chloride of sodium in the Argentine salt is shown by analysis to be 97·67 per cent.

Recent Views on Mashonaland.—Mr. Theodore Bent, in an article contributed to the "Fortnightly Review" for February, describes Mashonaland as unfit for settlers until the railway from the coast, to be completed in two years, shall have rendered it more accessible. He himself travelled from Umtali to Beira, at the mouth of the Pungwe River, in a two-wheeled cart drawn by asses, and says he saw £2,000 worth of waggons abandoned on the veldt owing to the loss of cattle through tsetse bite. Beira, in spite of fever, heat and sand, which render it at present a perfect penal settlement, has an excellent harbour, and will some day be known to fame as a flourishing seaport. "The Review of Reviews" for the same month retails the very optimistic impressions of Mr. De Waal, a Dutch colonist who accompanied Mr. Cecil Rhodes on his journey in September, 1891, and who controverts all the statements of Lord Randolph Churchill in his letters to the "Daily Graphic." Starting by steamer from Port Elizabeth, they landed at Beira, situated on the fine bay where the Pungwe River empties itself into the Indian Ocean, between the mouths of the Zambesi and Sabi rivers. Here they embarked on a river steamer, which ascends the Pungwe for seventy miles, the limit of the tideway and of navigation on the river. The latter is about a thousand yards wide at its mouth, and even half way up is as broad as the Thames at London Bridge, but only admits at high tide of the passage of a steamer drawing four and a half feet of water. The trying part of the journey begins when the river is left for the march to the interior through the malarious fever belt, where the heat is most oppressive and only pack animals can travel, as there is no road for wheeled vehicles. The proposed railway will traverse this zone of seventy miles in width, and connect the river with the highlands where waggon transport is again available. As there are no special difficulties to be surmounted its cost will scarcely exceed £200,000.

A Hunter's Paradise.—So Mr. De Waal characterises a strip of country some forty miles in width, which he describes as "one huge zoological garden."

Never before (he goes on) have I seen such abundance of wild animals. They have been left all these ages undisturbed by man, and the result is that for the sportsman no such region exists in the world. Great herds of buffaloes can be seen within gunshot of the road. You fire at a great buffalo bull, and the moment the report of your rifle is heard, you see you are in the midst of animals of all kinds. Wild pigs jump up to the right, to the left herds of koodoos rush away into the more distant glades, and

the whole forest seems suddenly instinct with life. You go a little further, and you come upon fresh spoors of herds of elephants, then you come upon giraffes and herds of quaggas and antelopes, and every description of animal which abounds in South Africa. It is, as I said, one great zoological garden for the whole of the forty miles.

Lions abound in this region, and are heard roaring in all directions throughout the night. The king of beasts is said to resemble the man-eating tiger of Bengal in becoming partial to human flesh, losing his taste for all other food when once he has tasted it. Kraals are often deserted on this account, as the man-eater returns day after day to carry off women, children, or solitary stragglers, and the tribe can only escape his ravages by trekking to another locality. Hippopotamuses and crocodiles are found in the deep holes of the rivers, and, to descend from the giant to the microscopic plagues of the country, swarms of mosquitoes haunt the Pungwe.

The Tableland of the Mashona Country.—At Umtali, 242 miles from the coast, the territory of the South African Company, on the healthy plateau of the interior, was entered. Thence to Fort Salisbury, a distance of 174 miles, an excellent waggon road has been constructed by Mr. Selous, the well-known hunter. As, however, there are no bridges, and it is intersected by ten great rivers, as well as minor watercourses, the country is impassable in the rainy season from January to March. This part of the Company's domain is described by Mr. De Waal as of wonderful beauty and fertility, recalling the scenery and climate of Italy. Fort Salisbury, reached in four weeks from Cape Town, had then a population of 300, who had been some time previously much discontented at a temporary famine of beer and champagne, the prices of which had gone up respectively to 15s. and £5 a bottle. From Fort Salisbury to Fort Victoria, lying south of it, another belt of country is traversed, which, though less picturesque than that crossed by the other route, is described as a vast expanse of magnificent pasture land. One of the leading Dutch farmers of the Cape Colony had just trekked north to take up land in this quarter, at the head of a party of twenty-five enterprising young men.

The Ant as a Fertiliser.—The value of the ant in rural economy is described as follows by Mr. De Waal:—

Wherever an ant-hill is found in the veldt, there is also luxuriant verdure, and in Mashonaland the ant-hills can be literally counted by the million. The whole of the soil is, as it were, turned over and thrown up to the surface by these little toilers, who in Africa perform the function which Darwin tells us is performed by the earthworms in your country.

Wherever you have an ant-hill you have fertile soil and sweet grass. It grows so luxuriantly that it is a common saying that you can pasture an ox on an ant-hill. As far as the eye can see in Mashonaland, the whole veldt is covered with ant-hills, and their existence is the best answer to the assertion (made by Lord Randolph Churchill) that the grass is sour. But even if you do not know the difference between sour grass and sweet grass, you have only to look at the cattle which abound on every side.

The veldt in the Transvaal, on the other hand, which Lord Randolph Churchill selected for special praise in contrast with that of Mashonaland, is, according to this authority, rendered absolutely valueless for grazing purposes by a poisonous tulip which is fatal to both sheep and cattle. As regards mining prospects, all that can as yet be said is that the analysis is exceptionally promising, but the real test will only be brought to bear when the rock-crushing machinery is in regular operation, and the productiveness of the reefs thus practically proved.

The Ruined City of Zimbabwe.—These unique remains are described as forming a great empty city built round a rock or citadel like Edinburgh Castle or the Acropolis at Athens. Its principal structure is the great temple, as large as the Coliseum though not so high, and with a central altar on which the party could have encamped. Its walls are from nine to ten feet in thickness, and the interior is in perfect preservation, with traces of worship which identify its builders, in the opinion of experts, with the ancient Phoenicians. Mr. E. Theodore Bent, on the other hand, who systematically explored the ruins, and made them the subject of a paper read before the Royal Geographical Society, on Monday evening, February 22nd, believes them to be the remains of an Arab city, erected in the pre-Mahomedan time when the Arabs were the great carriers and distributors of the East. It was, in his view, the capital of a considerable kingdom, as a series of similar ruins stretches up the whole west side of the Saba river. Its site had an elevation of 3,300 feet above the sea, and the existing remains cover a vast area of ground. They consist of a large circular building on a gentle rise, with a network of inferior buildings extending into the valley below, and the labyrinthine fortress on the hill about 400 feet above, naturally protected by huge granite boulders and a precipice running round a considerable portion of it. Some of the discoveries made had a special interest, from their bearing on the ancient methods of extracting gold.

Here (said the lecturer) stood a gold-smelting furnace, made of very hard cement, with a chimney of the same material, and very neatly

bevelled edges. Hard by, in a chasm between two boulders, lay all the rejected quartz casings from which the gold-bearing quartz had been extracted by exposing them to heat prior to the crushing. Near the furnace, too, they found many little crucibles of a composition of clay, which had been used for smelting the gold, and in nearly all of them existed small specks of gold adhering to the glaze formed by the heat of the process. There were tools also for extracting gold, burnishers, crushers, &c., and an ingot mould of soapstone of a curious form, which is still in use among the natives much farther north for ingots of iron. It is obvious that the ruins formed a garrison for the protection of a gold-producing race in remote antiquity, and such a race must be looked for outside the limits of Africa itself.

Mr. Maund, who took part in the discussion that followed the reading of the paper, said that he had recently returned from a visit to the different gold-fields, Hartley Hills, Umswezwe, Mazoe, and Umtali, and could testify to the enormous amount of work done by the ancients in the production of gold. In the three last-named districts there must have been tens of thousands of slaves at work taking out the softer parts of the casing of the reefs, and often working apparently for alluvial. With their imperfect appliances, however, much must have been lost so that with modern methods the mines should be infinitely more productive.

Rabbit Plague in New South Wales.—The Governor, Lord Jersey, and a party, returned to Sydney early in February from a visit to the rabbit-infested districts of the colony, around Cobar and Bourke in its western division. They report a terrible state of things, the increase of the pest in this comparatively small area during the last three years being estimated at 13 millions. The departmental experts estimate that 89 million acres, or nearly half the total area of the colony, are now infested by the scourge. In the dry regions where softer food is scarce, the rabbits have taken to eating wood, particularly the tender bark of the scrub vegetation. By devouring all that is within their reach, they effectually "ringbark" and kill the scrub growths, which during the long droughts furnish the sole means of keeping the sheep alive. The only feasible remedy suggested by the party is the setting of traps at the great tanks and water-holes during the dry season when no other water is available, and thus imposing some check on the increase of the enemy.

Proposed Communistic Settlement in Africa.—A novel experiment in colonisation is about to be tried on the slopes of Mount Kenia, within the British sphere of influence in East Africa, in the shape of a settlement embodying the ideal set forth in Dr. Hertzka's book, entitled "Freeland." No capital or private

property is to exist in this new Utopia, the members of which are to enjoy absolute freedom, and hold all real property in common, while each is to live by the fruits of his individual labour. The site chosen is described as an earthly paradise, with a sufficiently easy route by the river Tana, which is navigable for 300 kilometres, leaving a further journey of only 200 to the colony. Some 28 associations, counting 1,000 members are disposed to throw in their lot with the enterprise, whose promoters have already secured a capital of £2,000, the gift of one enthusiastic supporter. The necessary territory has been acquired, and two pioneer members are engaged on a voyage of investigation, on the result of which future arrangements will depend. Though the members are mainly Germans, they are most anxious to secure the support of the English as the great colonising nation, without whose participation nothing can be done.

Notes on Novels.

Freville Chase. By E. H. DERING. 2 vols.; second edition.
Art and Book Company, Leamington.

The Lady of Ravenscombe. By E. H. DERING. 2 vols.
Art and Book Company, Leamington.

THE Leamington Art and Book Company have done well to re-publish Mr. Dering's admirable tales, "Freville Chase" and "The Lady of Ravenscombe," the latter of which made its first appearance in the pages of *The Month*. We cordially hope that both books may meet with the welcome which they deserve. Mr. Dering's novels are didactic in the best and highest sense of the word. He does not write for the flippant or the frivolous; he expects from his reader just a little patience, some power of sustained attention, and a serious view of the issues of life; but, whoever will respond to these very moderate and reasonable demands will be well repaid. To a sound philosophical system, derived from a close study of St. Thomas, Mr. Dering unites a shrewd practical knowledge of human nature, and shows on every page a keen insight into the motives and impulses, the convictions and delusions, which work together with external circumstances in shaping the lives and the actions of men. With a very singular power of depicting to the life characters of ideal nobleness, and of

tracing—as far as it is given to man to trace—the workings of divine grace and the growth of faith in the souls of men and women of very diverse characters, he combines a hardly less remarkable faculty for dissecting and laying bare the psychological anatomy of many various forms of weakness, meanness, and selfishness. He is not content to show us his heroes acting heroically on critical occasions, but is careful to exhibit the gradual process of self-mastery, stimulated and aided by grace, by which alone a man attains a habit of heroic virtue truly so called. And not less instructive is his presentment of the various stages on the down-grade of self-seeking compromise by which men sink to the low levels of contemptible moral mediocrity or of malicious treachery. The reader is, or should be, distinctly the better for the hours spent in the company of Everard and Hubert Freville, of Father Merivale, with his sound good sense and solid unassuming piety, of Sir Roger Arden with his horror of rash judgments, uncharitable conversation, and (?) abstract principles, and of Mrs. Atherstone with her unobtrusive, unwearied well-doing; while on the other hand, the author's graphic picture of the weak worldliness and compromising Christianity of that “genealogical Catholic,” Sir Richard Dytchley, and of the unlimited self-concentration and self-delusion—issuing in a terrible power of mischief-making, and in the most odious double dealing—as displayed by his more masterful spouse, are, at least, as instructive as they are entertaining. The characters of Ida and Elfrida, embodying just so much of inherited weakness as to entail on themselves and on others much unhappiness and suffering, without forfeiting the reader's sympathy or their own ultimate welfare, are powerfully drawn; and the picture is skilfully filled in with the minor yet strongly individualized personalities of Dr. Ranston, Mrs. Roland, the short sighted, red-whiskered gentleman, whose name no one can remember, the landlady of the White Hart Hotel at Lyneham, and others. It may possibly be doubted whether the wicked Marquis—who, however, is penitent at the last—his rascally and ubiquitous servant, and the mysterious, somewhat tiresome “woman of the middling countenance,” are quite so true to nature as the more amiable personages who occupy the stage in “Freville Chase;” but if this be so, Mr. Dering may be pardoned for having been less successful in sounding the depths of villainy than in setting before his readers high ideals of life and action, and in infusing those broad principles of practical theology, of sound philosophy, and—be it added—of good breeding, of which he has made his novels the very agreeable vehicle.

NOTES ON NOVELS.

We have spoken of "Freville Chase" as being instructive, and, indeed, the didactic purpose of the author is all but openly avowed throughout; but the dramatic interest is well maintained and at times rises to intensity; while for genuine pathos we know of hardly a passage in the literature of fiction which can surpass some of the closing pages of "Freville Chase." A literary critic would perhaps take exception to a certain unnecessary minuteness of detail here and there, in the report of lengthened conversations of which it might have been sufficient to sketch the outline and indicate the issue. And it may perhaps be allowable to dissent in some degree from Mr. Dering's somewhat indiscriminate dislike—as it seems to us—of "modern" men and things. It is surely a part of true wisdom to recognise the great capabilities for good of the age in which we live, and, in a right sense, to respect the temper of the time. But the reader who has learned from Everard Freville and good old Sir Roger the valuable lesson of large-minded tolerance will see even in these blemishes—if blemishes they be—nothing worse than a slight exaggeration of those excellent qualities of thoroughness, conscientiousness, and earnestness of purpose, combined with a deep reverence for all that is noble in the traditions of the past, which characterise all Mr. Dering's work, and which give it its chief value.

We cannot do better, in conclusion, than quote some weighty words, written to the author by the late Venerable Archbishop Ullathorne :—

What I like in your way of putting points, as well to the Catholic as to the non-Catholic mind, is the clear sharp ring of the spirit of Faith *Ex ino pectore*. There is not a single quaver of human respect to enfeeble, in the least degree, the conviction in the mind of the reader, that the man who thus speaks, speaks what his soul most clearly sees. The story turns on two points, to which it serves as the framework—the principle of Faith and the principle of mixed marriages. The principle of Faith is put clearly, pointedly, and trenchantly. It is cleared of all lumber, and then shines by its own light. The mischief of mixed marriages is worked out through the story, and comes up with a number of unpleasant faces, repulsive as they are unpleasant. The shallow weakness of half Catholicity is brought out by the contrast with the utter worldliness with which it is linked and under which it succumbs. There are many tones and hints through the book of characters and manners, which bespeak a close observation of human life and ways. It is strong from its sharp incisiveness. It is no book, however, and consequently, for sentimentalists; nor for those who like something soft to weep over and then forget.

Of "The Lady of Ravenscombe" we have left ourselves no room to say more than that it forms a fitting sequel to "Freville Chase," to several of whose *dramatis personae* it again pleasantly and profitably introduces the reader.

An Imperative Duty. By W. D. HOWELLS. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1892.

THE duty which weighs so heavily on the conscience of Mrs. Meredith is one likely to appeal more forcibly to the American than to the European standard of honour. This lady appears on the scene as the guardian and sole relative of a young and lovely niece, and is introduced to the reader in an hotel at Boston where she has just arrived from Europe, as the patient of a Dr. Olney, staying there under similar circumstances. He quickly discovers that he is called upon to "minister to a mind diseased," and ends by being made the confidant of the lady's mysterious trouble. The latter resolves itself into the dilemma in which she finds herself placed by the probability of her niece's marriage, involving the necessity of imparting to her or to her suitor or both, the crushing fact that despite her beauty and grace, her distinction of air, and purity, if not fairness of skin, she has in her veins the dark taint of negro blood. Her father, a physician practising in New Orleans, had married there a beautiful octoroon, and had on his death left his little girl to be brought up by his sister. The cruel kindness of keeping the child in ignorance of her origin has now to be expiated by the necessity of imparting it to her at an age when it comes as a terrible revelation, with the result of utterly estranging the girl from her aunt and driving her into a state of mind bordering on insanity. Her first impulse is to rush into the street and seek the quarter of the humble coloured people that she may accustom herself to the horror of feeling her kinship with them, and the additional revulsion of feeling with which she regards them under these circumstances is powerfully realised. She returns to the hotel to find her aunt dying of the effects of an overdose of her sleeping draught, and thus goes through a second crisis in her fate, ere she has had time to realise the first. The *Deus ex machinā* is found in Dr. Olney, who has by this time fallen so thoroughly in love with her as to be willing to marry her with all her imperfections on her head.

Where Town and Country meet. By MRS. ALFRED BALDWIN. London: Longmans. 1891.

THE story of King Cophetua and the Beggar's Daughter is one that never fails to charm, no matter in what variety of fashions and how often told. The lordly wooer of the present volume is, indeed, but a prosperous farmer, whose notice of the

indigent girl among the throng of hop-pickers in his fields, seems to her almost as wonderful a condescension as that of the royal suitor to the beggar maiden of the ballad. Roger Applegarth, though embittered by a previous love-betrayal, the girl he was engaged to having eloped with another man on the eve of the wedding, has not lost the power of feeling or inspiring attachment in the seven years since spent in solitary seclusion. A remnant of the old bitterness shows itself, however, in his second wooing, in the tests to which he subjects the maiden of his choice before she knows that it has fallen upon her. He slips a sovereign among the silver pieces in which her wages are paid, in order to try if her honesty will withstand the temptation to keep it under the stress of her extreme poverty. Needless to say she comes out of the ordeal triumphantly, and is rewarded in a way she little expects. Her circumstances render the struggle of principle a specially severe one, as she is but a dressmaker on the verge of starvation, burdened with the charge of a little blind sister, to assist whose recovery from severe illness by the help of country 'air, unattainable in any other way, she has joined the rough and rowdy company of hop-pickers on their annual outing. The description of the latter, with its gipsy gaiety, pleasurable open-air occupation, and attendant drawbacks of very mixed company and manners, is vividly pictured in the experiences of Mary Gravenall and her helpless sister Ruth. All the figures in the rural drama are graphically outlined, and the character of Farmer Applegarth himself, with its strong capabilities both of resentment and tenderness, is thoroughly representative of the best features of that of the British yeoman. The volume serves to show that the power of investing a simple theme with the interest due to grace of narration is not yet lost to English literature.

My Danish Sweetheart. By W. CLARK RUSSELL. London: Methuen. 1891.

THIS romance of the sea is as full of strange and romantic adventure as any previous work of the author's, and none of his habitual readers can complain that they have been cheated in it of any of the thrilling emotions he is accustomed to rouse in their breasts. Never indeed was a wooing conducted under circumstances of more harrowing peril and disaster than that of the fair-haired Dane, Helga Nielsen, by her Cornish *preux chevalier*, Hugh Tregarthen. From the moment when he sets foot on her father's ship out of the

lifeboat in which he had come to rescue her crew, all imaginable perils of the sea thicken over the heads of the devoted couple, and each apparent deliverance only leaves them in a situation of greater perplexity than the last. Rescued from the open raft which has been the scene of the death of the girl's father, they find themselves on board a scarcely more seaworthy craft, a half-decked Deal lugger, in charge of three seamen, who have undertaken the hopeful enterprise of navigating her to Australia. When picked up off this cockle-shell, which is naturally rendered helpless by the first gale, and sheltered in comparative safety in a roomy barque bound to the Cape of Good Hope, we might fairly conclude the worst perils of their voyage over, but here a fresh embarrassment, and later on a more terrible experience await them. As soon, indeed, as we find ourselves confronted with a crew of Malays, and a Captain whose fanatical piety takes the form of compelling them to dine on pork or not at all, we know that nothing less than murder and mutiny can come of such a conjunction. The inevitable catastrophe leaves the hero and heroine alive, but practically prisoners in the hands of the half-savage mutineers, and the drama heightens in interest with the antagonism of the two parties in the ship, and the successive attempts of each to outwit the other. The narration of these adventures leaves little space for those descriptive passages in which the author's fancy generally finds such free play, and we have more of the human and less of the meteorological element than in his other works.

Blanche, Lady Falaise. By J. C. SHORTHOUSE. London : Macmillan. 1891.

THE adage as to the facility with which hearts are caught in the rebound, is amply exemplified in fiction since the love-lorn heroine is never so ready to marry the first eligible man who asks her, as when most dismally blighted in a previous attachment. The protagonist of Mr. Shorthouse's tale is a fresh addition to the ranks of those ladies who show their constancy to their first lovers by making things generally uncomfortable after a prosperous and otherwise happy marriage. Lady Falaise is indeed throughout her career distinguished by a rare perversity of mind, since she begins by throwing away the goods the gods have provided and rejecting an offer of marriage from her father's pupil, a young man boasting incalculable length of ancestry, an illimitable rent-roll, and personal charms which would have eclipsed those of Antinous. This from

the daughter of a country rector who ekes out his income by coaching for the universities, is rather too bad, but it is made worse by her engaging herself to a fashionable preacher, who jilts her for a richer and better-connected bride on the first convenient opportunity. Here Lord Falaise, previously rejected, gallantly steps into the breach, and bestows on her all the worldly goods we have already enumerated. In his wooing, he has indeed put them forward a little too undisguisedly, as he urges her to marry him telling her that he is "the premier viscount in England," whose ancestors might have been "earls or anything," and that lots of girls would have been glad to marry him. In this latter asseveration his Lordship was no doubt perfectly right, but it might have been better taste to omit it from his argument.

Blanche, however, though accepting these alleviations of her lot, is too high-toned and lofty-souled to find consolation in them, and plays perhaps the most provoking of all parts, that of the lugubriously dutiful wife, perennially mourning her perfidious preacher. The latter turns out badly enough to have disenchanted a more commonplace personage, as he not only falls into the habit of drinking port wine to excess, but incurs the penalty of the law for forging a cheque. The day he comes out of prison, Blanche, who is by that time partly or wholly insane, is mercifully disposed of by a well-directed stroke of lightning in the Tyrol, and her death, intended in some mystical sense as an expiation for his crimes, is simultaneous with his conversion. The conclusion is somewhat lame and impotent, and the interest of the story is entirely due to the author's well-known grace of style. It is marred, too, by a fault in construction, the principal events being summarised in the prologue, before their subsequent narration in detail. The most sympathetic character is that of the old rector, Blanche's father, whose simple tenderness is contrasted with the pretentious speciousness of her lover.

One Reason Why. By BEATRICE WHITBY. London: Hurst and Blackett. 1892.

THE favourable impression created by "The Awakening of Mary Fenwick" has not been falsified by the author's present work. Its interest, too, is the legitimate one founded on the power of delineating character and does not depend on the exaggerated effects of melodramatic sensation. The devices of the transpontine drama are by this time thoroughly used up in fiction, and the

[No. 2 of *Fourth Series.*] z

public, weary of the cheap imitations of the leaders of the school, are ready to revert once more to the forms of arts prescribed by the older canons of taste. On this ground "One Reason Why" deserves to be received with favour, despite the drawback of a slightly commonplace plot. The latter turning on the threadbare situation of a governess, fallen in love with by the eldest son of her employer, is redeemed from insipidity by the loftiness and dignity of the character of the heroine, Ursula, or "Isla" Nugent. The hero, Luttrell Wollaston, though immeasurably her inferior in moral worth, has the saving merit of appreciating her, and of thus developing a depth of feeling in his attachment to her that in one sense raises him to her level. The repelling coldness assumed as the defensive armour of her pride, exercises an attractive power over him stronger at first than the arts of the most refined coquetry, but eventually angers him to the extent of driving him into an engagement to another, and thus creating a complication of obstacles to be vanquished before their eventual union becomes possible. The way is smoothed by the tragical death of Luttrell's young step-mother, and the inconstancy of her mercenary betrothed in forsaking him for a suitor of higher rank. There is a delightful pair of children, "Bay" and "Ellie," short for Elidora, whose quaint ways and doings are fascinating to the reader. The secondary characters are all distinctively drawn, and the picture of the Le Terrier family, with their slipshod household, and undisciplined struggle for existence, is full of humorous vitality.

Notes on Foreign Periodicals.

NOTES ON GERMAN PERIODICALS, BY CANON BELLESHEIM,
OF AACHEN.

"**Katholik.**"—The first issue of 1872 opens with a very instructive article contributed by Father Schepers, of the Redemptorist Fathers of Vaals, near Aachen, on the last fifty years of English Catholicism. He is very successful in tracing the general history of the Church in the United Kingdom from the Act of Emancipation, and further in delineating several leading persons who, in their conversion to the faith of our fathers, startled the great public, and led many other pious Anglicans to take the same step. We regret to

say that the clever author of this series of articles, well worthy of perusal, has since been carried off by a premature death. As we are living in an eminently historical age we need not be astonished, that, owing to unwearied historical researches, not a few champions of the Catholic faith in the period of the so-called reformation are being dragged from oblivion and put in their proper place. Amongst them let us bring into prominence John Fabri, O.P., of Heilbronn, whose life and various writings are interestingly described in the "Katholik" by Abbé Paulus, a priest and extremely gifted historical scholar belonging to the Diocese of Strassburg, but residing in Munich. The inexhaustible treasures of history, of which the Hof-und Staatsbibliothek of Munich is justly proud, have enabled him to perform his work in such a way as to earn for him general admiration. In these pithy articles he devotes himself to pointing out not only the missionary work of Fabri, but also his literary accomplishments and manifold writings so well adapted to the peculiar wants of German Catholics on those troubled times. Let us mention above all his catechism and booklets of preparation for confession, and his masterly work on the primacy of St. Peter. Of course, these and other works of Catholics intended to check the floods of the Reformation were carefully destroyed, and it is not seldom that we meet with a case of their being preserved in a single copy. All the more deserved is the praise due to the untiring exertions of those scholars who are bent on unearthing these precious treasures. Professor Weber, of Ramberg, is contributing a series of articles on my history of the Catholic Church of Ireland. The much agitated question of re-admitting the Society of Jesus into Germany affords a welcome motive to a very clever writer for sketching, in an extremely well-written article, the merits of the German Jesuit Fathers in the several departments of science. Here we may only urge on the attention of scholars their *Collectio Conciliorum recentiorum*, their *Philosophia Lacensis*, and the critical commentary of the whole Bible now in the press in Paris. Lastly we may mention an instructive notice of Dr. Bäumker's third volume on the German ecclesiastical hymns. This work, the result of laborious investigations and great critical acumen, calls for the study of all scholars who desire to write upon the history of the German people.

"Historisch-politische Blätter."—In the January issue I wrote a long review of F. Cathrein's, J.S., momentous work "Moral Philosophie" (Freiburg, Herder). These two bulky volumes are really an event in our theological literature and a most powerful vindication of Christianity and Catholicism against those subtle

attacks of modern systems which we have to face in almost every country. F. Cathrein's familiarity with English literature and the destructive moral principles of Bentham, Mill and Spencer, and others, is really admirable and well worthy of the attention of English scholars. Several years ago the same author presented us with a scholarly critique of Herbert Spencer's Ethics. If proof were needed, the works of Cathrein afford it abundantly for the absolute necessity of the revival of the scholastic philosophy. In it we are provided with the only means for successfully combating modern errors. Mediæval folk-lore has been thoroughly treated for many years by Dr. Falk. To the January issue he contributes a learned treatise on the care bestowed by the Catholic Church during the middle ages on the catechetical instruction of the people. Noteworthy are the explanations of the Ten Commandments as published on fly leaves. Some of the best specimens are now-a-days in the possession of the British Museum. Those leaves, commonly adorned by excellent woodcuts, mark, too, an epoch in the development of Christian art. The more the literary treasures bequeathed to us by our forefathers are unearthed, the better we perceive the utter falsehood of so many charges which the reformers made against the Church. Not a few English Catholics who, in the time of King Louis I., lived in Munich may have become acquainted with Professor von Ringseis, one of the most celebrated medical men, and a strong champion of Catholic interests. His gifted daughter has just brought out the concluding volume of his memoirs, which throw new light on the prominent persons of that period. In the February issue we meet with an article which must impress us with sorrow and grief. "Are German Universities still pervaded by a Christian spirit?" The most deplorable fact cannot be denied that a current of thought totally at variance, not only with Catholicism, but with any Christian creed whatever, is more and more on the increase. The article brings into prominence the incontestable fact that the tenets adopted by social democrats in some shape or other are professed by not a few teachers in our academies.

"Stimmen aus Maria Laach."—For two thoughtful articles on the Columbus Centenary we are indebted to F. Perger. The result of his studies is that Columbus set himself to become a Christophorus, a bearer of Christ, whose spiritual kingdom he strove to extend in the new world. F. Zimmermann is tracing the history of Dr. Tait before he became a bishop and Metropolitan. F. Beissel describes the development of religious painting in Germany in recent times. Pascal's character is masterfully described in several articles

contributed by F. Kreiten, to whom we are under special debt for his excellent critical biographies of Molière and Voltaire.

"Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie (Innsbruck)."--This very able periodical contains the concluding article on Professor Doellinger, contributed by F. Michael. We become acquainted with the views which Doellinger took of Old-Catholicism and his exertions towards establishing a communion between the several non-Catholic bodies of various countries. That he utterly failed in these enterprises is as widely known as his ever-increasing hostility against the Church of which for many years he was a splendid ornamen. For England this article should be brimful of interest, since F. Michael accurately describes Doellinger's intercourse with the then leaders of the Anglican Church. F. Felchlin argues on the difference between essence and existence, as established by St. Thomas, whilst Professor Schmid enlarges on the moot point whether or not the consecration of both species belongs to the essence of the sacrifice of the Mass. A wide interest attaches to F. Dreves's solid critique of "*Les Poèmes latins attribués à Saint Bernard, par B. Haureau.*" F. Dreves, who ranks foremost as a scholar in mediæval poetry, declares the result of his studies to be that only two hymns may be traced to the authorship of St. Bernard, viz., the hymn on St. Victor (Migne, P.L. vol. 183 vol. F.F. 5) and the hymn on St. Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh.

Notices of Books.

Succat. The story of Sixty Years of the life of St. Patrick. By Monsignor GRADWELL. London : Burns and Oates.

THE opening lines in chap. v., p. 134., give us the key to Monsignor Gradwell's book on the early life of St. Patrick. He says, "the reader who has kindly perused the previous chapters must have sympathised with me that I had to deal with such scanty materials, and perhaps may have set slight value upon the narrative as being drawn more from the imagination than from real historical sources. I must confess the actual facts have been few. Yet they *were* facts." The author tells us plainly that the local colouring of the history is his own creation, and therefore his work so far is not purely

historical. This filling in lends a vividness to the narrative, and can do no harm when the avowal of its origin is expressly made. The history is founded, however, on a substratum of solid fact, as Monsignor Gradwell has skilfully interwoven into his book every scrap of knowledge that we possess regarding St. Patrick's life before he commenced his great missionary career. It would add to the undoubted value of the work if Monsignor Gradwell gave us in the next edition a list of his authorities for his more important facts, with the exact references in an extra appendix. For instance, to select one out of many such, the captivity and marriage of Conchessa, St. Patrick's mother, are facts relating to St. Patrick of which we should wish to know the exact historical value. The authority for statements similar to this would be a great boon.

In a few minor incidents conclusions are drawn of wider extent than the facts permit, but all the main outlines are strictly and historically accurate.

Monsignor Gradwell's book is an excellent one to place in the hands of grown boys and girls. Without at all derogating from its genuine worth for readers of mature ages, we think it admirably suited to the young. An Irish boy just leaving school, with all the Celtic poetry of his nature, cannot but be impressed with the fascinating portrait of the Apostle of his race as sketched by Monsignor Gradwell. St. Patrick's dauntless heroism in never shirking difficulty or danger, the gentle winning tenderness of that great fiery heart, are such as to appeal with special force to the romantic chivalrous character of an Irish boy. Neither Bayard nor Sir Tristram were as much to the young squire of mediaeval chivalry who sought to win knightly spurs, as St. Patrick is to the boys of modern Ireland. St. Patrick is for them an epitome of all that is noblest, highest and best. His name is the rallying word of their fatherland and their faith. It is a symbol of fidelity which even death cannot conquer. The little they know of the history of their own country excites mixed feelings in their breast: sorrow for so many reverses in the past, and at the same time a proud exultation at the undying vitality of their faith—pure to-day as when St. Patrick preached it at the command of Celestine, and to-day, as it always has been, unconquered and unconquerable.

The want of minute technical historical authority for each individual statement in Monsignor Gradwell's book is amply compensated by the glowing living portrait of the hero and the saint which is there given us. This leads us to speak of another excellent quality of the book, namely, the current of strong fervent piety which

runs through its pages, and all the better and stronger for not being so prominently set forth. The book we are certain will be a favourite with ecclesiastical students. It supplies them too with that modicum of the ecclesiastical history of the period which will help to widen their views regarding St. Patrick and his work.

With the historical groundwork of the book we can have no quarrel. It is exact in every particular. The birth of St. Patrick in Strathelyde, his captivity at the age of sixteen, his visit to St. Martin, and his ecclesiastical training at Lerins and under St. Germain are all duly set forth. The proofs advanced by Monsignor Gradwell for St. Patrick's visit to various parts of England previous to the commencement of his Irish mission will challenge criticism. They are the best procurable, as the evidence itself is scanty, and we have no other. The reader will judge for himself what weight must be attached to them. The appendix on the question of St. Patrick's birth-place is very valuable. The paper, type, and binding are excellent. We recommend the book most strongly.

P.L.

Notre Seigneur Jesus Christ, sa vie and ses enseignements.

Par M. L'Abbé S. E. Fretté, du clergé de Paris. Paris : P. Lethielleux, 10, Rue Cassette, 1892.

STILL another life of Our Lord from a French pen ! It is a good sign to find so many of them ; it shows that there is a demand in France for wholesome reading. The Abbé S. E. Fretté divides this new life into three books, which fill over two bulky imperial octavo volumes. The first book treats of Our Lady and of the infancy of Our Lord ; in addition it has some well written chapters on the state of parties in Judæa, on the topography of the Holy City, on the priests and on the synagogues. The Pharisees are, it seems, to us particularly well described.

The second book treats of the Public Life of Our Lord up to the Passion. The third book is occupied with the Passion, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, and closes with an estimate of the human character of Jesus Christ.

The author spends no time on the discussion of the exact date of Our Lord's birth. He does not notice the controversy as to the time of the adoration of the Magi, and makes no allusion to a journey on the part of the Holy Family to Nazareth immediately after the Presentation. Perhaps he thinks that, with hour of Our

Lord, narration is more profitable than discussion if the latter can be avoided. We have found these two volumes very pleasant and instructive reading. They help to give a reality and vividness to situations, phrases, and actions which fail to impress their fullest meaning on the ordinary reader as they stand in the New Testament. For this they need to be thrown over into greater prominence by the filling in of their appropriate background, to be emphasized by local colouring and illustrative explanation. This has been very efficiently done by the running commentary of allusion to the natural scenery, the history, the customs of the country and the people. The result is that we have a work eminently calculated to help in the composing of a sermon, or in the spending of an hour in holy and interesting reading.

The author appears to have been very happy in the manner in which he has unravelled the appearances of the Maries at the tomb on the morning of the Resurrection.

A few misprints appear to have escaped the lynx eye of the proof reader, *e.g.*, *naissance* for *mort*, I., page 58; and *Jerusalem* for some other place, page 77. No doubt such slight blemishes will disappear in a second edition, which we hope may be soon called for. A good map of Palestine, and an excellent one of the Sea of Galilee accompany the first volume; another showing the journeying of Our Lord is attached to the second volume, as well as a plan of Jerusalem.

J.R.

O Roma nobilis. Philologische Untersuchungen aus dem Mittelalter von LUDWIG TRAUBE. München, 1891.

THIS collection of able philological treatises forms part of the transactions of the Royal Academy of Munich. Excellent as appears to be the first essay on the time-honoured hymn, "O Roma nobilis," which, according to Dr. Traube, originated in northern Italy, and probably in Verona, between the ninth and eleventh century, we lay no special stress on at present. But what in a high degree calls for our admiration is Traube's investigations into the merits of mediaeval Irishmen in Germany in the department of philology. Whether his theory of not less than four Dungals will weather the storm of criticism seems to me doubtful. But the laboriously collected notices on Sedulius Scottus are a decided success. Many notices, which have escaped the attention of even Irish scholars, are brought together and critically sifted by our author. He

establishes by solid reasons that Sedulius is the author of Codex C. 14 in the library of the hospital of Cues (between Coblenz and Treves), which may be styled a store-house for mediæval philology.

BELLESHEIM.

The Lord of Humanity, or the Testimony of Human Consciousness, with Supplement on the Mystery of Suffering.

By FREDERICK JAMES GANT, F.R.C.S. Second Editon. London : Longmans, Green & Co. 1891.

THIS book is written with the best possible intentions, and evidently much thought and study has been expended upon it. But it labours under the double defect of being the work of an amateur theologian, and further of one who is on many points the victim of the Protestant tradition. Dr. Gant probably knows nothing of the rich mine of learning to be found in the literature of the Catholic schools of theology on the subjects of the Sacred Humanity and the Divine Personality of our Blessed Lord. He writes as if he were a pioneer, and makes no use of the labours of his predecessors. In all sciences such a procedure gives very unsatisfactory results, and theology is no exception to the rule.

The Life of Father Hecker.—By the Rev. WALTER ELLIOTT.
New York : The Columbus Press, 1891.

THE interesting life of Father Hecker, which has been appearing for some months in the New York *Catholic World*, is here reprinted in a handsome volume, which deserves a place in every Catholic library, in the section devoted to lives of the men who have done good work for the Church in our day.

The son of a family of German origin settled in New York, Father Hecker was a thorough American and a thorough man of his age. Born a Protestant, he was led, after much wandering in search of truth, into the bosom of the Catholic Church. From the day of his conversion he thought chiefly of how he could influence others of his countrymen to take the same step, and above all he was busy with the work of smoothing the way to the Church for educated, intellectual men. He joined the Redemptorist congregation, but his life work did not lie there. Separated from them by a crisis, which, while it freed him from his obedience to the order, did not break the ties of affection he always felt for it, he founded the

Paulist congregation in New York, on lines which he believed to be specially adapted for the needs of the United States. But this was only one of his good works. He did more than any other individual in the States to develop and raise the level of Catholic literature in America. To quote the words of his biographer :—

“ He believed in types as he believed in pulpits. He believed that the printing office was necessary to the convent. To him the Apostolate of the Press meant the largest amount of truth to the greatest number of people. By its means a small band of powerful men could reach an entire nation, and elevate its religious life.”

At times his way of expressing his opinions laid him open to adverse criticism, but all he wrote and spoke had a sound sense, and there was never a more thoroughly loyal son of the Church. Unlike some short-sighted doubters, he rejoiced heartily in the Vatican definitions as strengthening the position of the Church for her battle with her enemies, and preparing the way for new triumphs. Not the least interesting of the many fragments of Father Hecker’s writings, which have found their way into print for the first time in the volume before us, is a memorandum, in which, shortly before the Council, he summed up for his own guidance the principles which he thought ought to be the rule of conduct for a Catholic writer. They are well worth quoting here. Observe how he speaks of himself very unceremoniously in the third person :—

1. Absolute and unswerving loyalty to the authority of the Church, wherever and however expressed, as God’s authority upon earth and for all time.
2. To seek in the same dispositions the true spirit of the Church, and to be unreservedly governed by it as the wisdom of the Most High.
3. To keep my mind and heart free from all attachments to schools, parties or persons within the Church, Hecker included, so that nothing within me may hinder the light and direction of the Holy Spirit.
4. In case any conflict arises concerning what Hecker may have spoken or written, or any work or movement in which he may be engaged, to re-examine. If wrong, make him retract at once. If not, then ask: Is the question of that importance that it requires defence and the upsetting of attacks? If not of this importance, then not to delay and perhaps jeopardise the progress of other works, and condemn Hecker to simple silence.
5. In the midst of the imperfections, abuses, scandals, etc., of the human side of the Church, never to allow myself to think or to express a word which might seem to place a truth of the Catholic faith in doubt, or to savor of the spirit of disobedience.
6. With all this in view, to be the most earnest and ardent friend of all true progress, and to work with all my might for its promotion through existing organizations and authorities.

Much of Father Hecker's character is revealed in these rules. Not the least testimony to his worth is contained in the words which Cardinal Newman wrote on hearing of his death. "I have ever felt that there was this sort of unity in our lives—that we had both begun a work of the same kind, he in America, and I in England, and I know how zealous he was in promoting it."

Die christlichen Inschriften der Rheinlande. Zweiter Theil.

Von Professor F. X. KRAUS. Freiburg, Mohr., 1892.

THE first part of this standard work was noticed in the DUBLIN REVIEW, October, 1891, (p. 486). To the unwearied labour of its gifted author we are now indebted for the first instalment of the second part, which reaches from the middle of the eighth to the middle of the thirteenth century. In the part before us, we find duly collected the Christian inscriptions still in existence in the ancient dioceses of Chur, Basel, Constance, Strasbourg, Spires, Worms, Mainz, and Metz. The work is done with all that critical accuracy and eminent historical and, above all, archaeological learning for which Professor Kraus enjoys a special reputation. Not a few precious inscriptions which otherwise would have been lost are now, through our author's activity, duly preserved and made accessible to students of archaeology. Inscriptions of every kind are here presented. Besides those on graves and sarcophagi, we meet with inscriptions of the most interesting shape on church doors and ecclesiastical vestments. The author is to be sincerely congratulated for having enriched his works by very large photographs exhibiting not a few pictures of embroideries belonging to the far-famed Convent of St. Blase. English and Irish scholars will find a wide field of discussion opened out by the inscriptions on S. Gall (p. 10). It is much to be deplored that so many churches where, in the seventh and eighth centuries, Irish missionaries laboured have preserved so few traces of them down to the period discussed in this volume. Let me mention inscriptions on S. Firmin (p. 61) and S. Dizibodus (p. 132), both of them, as is generally admitted, Irishmen, but whose origin in the inscription is not touched on even by a single word. Mainz has supplied many inscriptions on her celebrated bishops. Next to her come Spires, with the tombs of the German Emperors, and Metz, where so many members of Charlemagne's family were laid to their eternal rest. Let us hope that the laborious author will ere long issue the concluding part, which is to supply the preface and a solid commentary on the vast contents.

BELLESHEIM.

**Rituale Romanum Cui novissima accedit Benedictionum et
Instructionum Appendix.** Editio tertia post typicam.
Ratisbonae, Pustet, 1892.

THE indefatigable proprietor of this large liturgical printing establishment presents us at the beginning of 1892 with a splendid edition of the Roman Ritual. The form is large octavo, with excellent type and strong paper. What is principally to be noted is the exceedingly well executed woodcuts, which remind us of the best patterns of Christian art in this department. The "get up" and printing may successfully rival any works produced in times gone by at the Plantinian Press in Antwerp. Besides, this sumptuous edition is enriched by—(1), the Appendix to the Roman Ritual, specially approved of by the Holy See; (2), the Roman *Instructio*, giving directions to such priests as are provided with papal faculties for blessing rosaries and pictures; and (3), the *Benedictiones Norissimae*. The English clergy will meet on page 138 a benediction indulged by the Holy See for the Archdiocese of Cologne for "blessing the water of St. Willibrord," that great Englishman of the eighth century, who so successfully laboured as a missionary and bishop in our country. The price is comparatively moderate.

B.

The Lord's Supper and the Passover Ritual; being a Translation of the substance of Prof. Bickell's "Messe und Pascha." By W. F. SKENE, D.C.L. With an Introduction by the Translator on the connection of the Early Christian with the Jewish Church. (Price 5s.) Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1891

THE rather long title of this book sufficiently describes its contents. Prof. Bickell's work has been so fully analysed by the present writer in a former number (October, 1889) of this Review, as to make further notice unnecessary. It will be enough to call the attention of all engaged in liturgical studies to the translation of this indispensable work. By undertaking it, Dr. Skene has earned the gratitude of all to whom German is a difficulty. It is however needful to warn such readers that the most interesting and important of the "Dogmatic Conclusions" drawn by Dr. Bickell are omitted by his translator, apparently because they are not in accord with his own theological views. Whether such a suppression is just to Dr. Bickell, we must leave to him for decision; it is certainly not fair to his English readers. Dr. Skene's own contribution to the volume contains matter of interest, but also much that would prob-

ably have been altered on reconsideration—such as the paradoxical view that the seven deacons first appointed were presbyters. The most valuable parts are those derived from Probst's great work “*Liturgie*;” though here again the reader must not suppose that Dr. Skene gives any idea of the work which he professes to have followed.

Texts and Studies, contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature.

Vol. I., No. 1. *The Apology of Aristides*, edited and translated by J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., with an appendix by J. Armitage Robinson, M.A. Cambridge: University Press, 1891.

THE Christian Apologists of the second century give the answer to the challenge to Christianity conveyed in Pliny the Younger's despatch to Trajan. The Catholic Faith began now to shine, not only by its own light, but in the fierce glare of gathering and deliberate persecution. The persecutions of the first century had arisen either on accidental issues like that of Nero, or on personal grounds rather than of policy, like that of Domitian. But in the second century the empire became conscious of a drain on its moral and religious forces, and of a camp of deserters from the deified majesty of Cæsar set up everywhere; of an asylum of renegades from the Capitoline Jove and the Palatine Apollo, opened everywhere within its limits. Against these dangerous symptoms to the internal tranquillity of the empire the forces of policy began to organise themselves. That empire found itself confronted by a society whose numbers made it formidable, but the genius and spirit of whose writers were soon to develop the power of reason reinforcing Faith in the Apologists. We have before us the apology of Aristides now complete from a newly discovered Syriac early version, besides a large recovery of the original Greek, and a smaller but considerable fragment of the Armenian, of which the Venetian editors have given a Latin translation, whilst Mr. L. C. Conybeare, of Oxford, has translated the same from another copy into English. The fragment contains the opening chapters. When first published by “the learned Armenians of the Lazarist Monastery at Venice,” it was condemned as spurious by M. Renan; chiefly on account of some later amplifications of the text, especially an equivalent to the term Θεοτόκος (for it appears to have been made from the Greek) as savouring of fourth century theology. That term has no equivalent in the Syriac, which was found by the

editors "in a volume of Syriac extracts, preserved in the library of the Convent of St. Catharine," visited by them in 1889. The volume numbered 16 among the Syriac MSS. there, "may be referred to the seventh century," and "is made up of separate treatises, mostly ethical in character." Aristides belongs with Quadratus to the earlier Apologists, whom Justin Martyr, Tatian and others follow. The question of the dates of these earlier two is sifted with great minuteness by the editors. The nett result leaves Quadratus, although with some little doubt, in the period of Hadrian, while Aristides is now concluded to have presented his apology to Antoninus Pius, early in that prince's reign. The belief that the latter also addressed Hadrian seems founded on a mistake arising from the adoption of Antoninus by Hadrian, whose name the former included by custom with his own, thus making him "Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Pius Augustus Cæsar." In the course of ages and their translations, the latter or distinctive part became lost, until retrieved in the present Syriac version, while that of Hadrian remained. An interesting point raised is that of the contact of Celsus, the Anti-Christian philosopher, with Aristides; and sufficient instances of parallel lines in the attack of Celsus with those traced by Aristides in his apology are adduced, to make that contact probable. Celsus is chiefly known from Origen's work against him. Perhaps the most interesting feature in the Apology is the outline of a creed or *symbolum fidei* deducible from it, which the editors present as follows:—

We believe in one God Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and in Jesus Christ His Son. . . . Born of the Virgin Mary. . . . He was pierced by the Jews: He died and was buried: The third day He rose again: He ascended into Heaven. . . . He is about to come to judge.

Aristides calls himself "a philosopher of Athens," retaining "the philosophic dress with a view to future service in the gospel." But the assumed tone of dispassionate moderation soon drops away and that of the eager advocate appears. A single quotation from Plato's *Timæus* regarding the "impossibility of discovering and presenting to all men the Maker and Father of this universe," (Plato, *Timæus*, 28c.) bespeaks the professional student. The opening section deals with the nature and being of God,—

Who moveth all things. . . . Who made all for the sake of men. . . . without beginning and without end, immortal, complete, and incomprehensible. . . . He is altogether wisdom and understanding. . . . He asks no sacrifice nor libation—nor anything from anyone, but all ask of Him.

The author then distributes the human race into four classes, "Barbarians, Greeks, Jews, and Christians." But only Greek mythology is quoted, viz., Kronos, Rhea, and the rest of their gods for the first of these. The Jewish patriarchal descent and their sojourn in Egypt are next traced. From what follows concerning the Christians the above *Symbolum* is extracted. Some whole sentences are remarkable,—

God came down from Heaven and from a Hebrew virgin took and clad Himself with flesh, and in a daughter of man there dwelt the Son of God.

Belief in the Resurrection after three days and subsequent Ascension is also added. This is taught from that gospel which a little "while ago was spoken among them as being preached." Oral transmission, however, is not now the sole source. "Take now," he later urges, "their writings and read them, and ye will find that not of myself have I brought these things." This reference to standard writings, the elements of a future Canon, is significant. The great bulk of the apology consists in the usual exposure of the gross conceits and degrading traditions of heathenism all round, from Barbarians to Egyptians. To the former is ascribed the worship of "the elements," viz., "earth, air, fire, and water;" of the sun and of ancestors. Among the Greeks all the legends of the Pantheon receive due castigation; as do those of Isis, Osiris, Typhon, and Horus, among the Egyptians, on whom the worship of various animal and vegetable forms is also charged, "they having erred with a great error above all peoples that are upon the face of the earth."

The curiosity attaching to the Greek text, first published by Boissonades at Paris in 1832, and reprinted in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* among the works of St. John of Damascus, lies in the totally new use to which the apology, or a large portion of it, is put. It forms part of a religious romance, named "The Life of SS. Barlaam and Josaphat," which turns upon the young son of a persecuting Indian king, to his father's horror, converted to the faith, and upon a *ruse*, by which his apostacy is to be ensured, being over-ruled by inspiration so as to fortify him, and to convert the heathen father, court, and people into the bargain. The argument, which is made to be thus victorious, follows largely the lines of the apology of Aristides, as shewn in the Syriac version and confirmed, with some exceptions, by the Armenian fragment. The romance is believed to go back to the sixth century, or perhaps earlier still. It has a historical completeness about it which might mislead the unwary into a notion of its containing a fuller measure of genuineness.

Probably the reverse of this would be the more correct inference. Thus, the Christological passage in the Greek says that “(by the Holy Spirit) He came down from heaven (for the salvation of men), born (without generation and incorruptibility),” where the bracketed clauses are wanting in the Syriac. The Greek further adds, “and having fulfilled His marvellous economy, through the Cross he tasted of death, by His own spontaneous design.”

It refers also more precisely to “the Holy Scripture called by them (Christians) that of the Gospel.” A fuller stress is laid on the mission of the Twelve, “even as one of them journeyed to the regions about us preaching the doctrine of truth.” God is “the creator and framer of all things in His only-begotten Son and the Holy Spirit,” and Christians “have the commandments of the same Lord Jesus Christ engraved on their hearts, waiting for the resurrection of the dead and life of the world to come.” The anti-Christian attitude of the Jews is also more expressly brought out, and the singular charge of the Syriac, that “their service is to angels and not to God, in that they observe Sabbaths, etc.,” disappears. Interesting parallels are adduced between the “preaching of Peter,” of which fragments are preserved by Clement of Alexandria, and our apology, as also between the “Sibylline Oracles” and this latter. Glimpses of the “Two Ways,” as exhibited in the “Teachings of the Apostles,” also appear in Aristides. The conclusion suggested by a careful comparison is, that the Greek made too many sacrifices to the standpoint of the romance for it to be taken as correcting the Syriac; while the latter, seeming to miss, as checked by the Armenian, but little of the original, develops exegetical clauses freely, and occasionally mistakes the sense.

HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.

Life of General de Sonis. By Mgr. BAUNARD. Translated by Lady Herbert. London: Art and Book Company. 1892.

WE feel certain that the short work before us will be perused with deep interest by a large number of our readers. It appeals to so many and to such varied sides of life, that it cannot fail to prove attractive to many, who though neither heroes nor soldiers, may yet in other aspects of his life, gather some useful lessons from General de Sonis. In every relation of life the subject of this biography appears to have been admirable. A dutiful son, an affectionate husband and father, a brave soldier submissive as a subaltern, and considerate, active and distinguished as a general, an honourable and high-minded gentleman, a thoroughly disinterested

man, and above all, a devout Christian and a zealous consistent Catholic : all this to a remarkable extent we find united in General de Sonis. Moreover his life was spent in stirring times and amidst exciting scenes. The son of a soldier and the father of three others, he belonged to a military race in the best sense of the word. The General from an early age showed a marked predilection for his profession ; as a child his favourite walk was in a square where he could watch soldiers at their drill, and his greatest pleasure was being placed in front of his father on horseback, when he would enjoy a gallop amongst the tropical beauties of Guadeloupe, where the regiment was quartered at the time of his birth and during the early years of his life.

After the usual course of education at the military college of St. Cyr, De Sonis was attached to the Fifth Hussars, an appointment which greatly pleased him, as his love for horses made the cavalry especially attractive in his eyes. He shortly after married a lady to whom he was devotedly attached, and who appears from the slight sketch we gather of her in these pages, to have been in no way unworthy of him. Their married life was not without its domestic trials ; they were never rich, and their children were numerous ; and, worse than all, the duties of a soldier's life were for ever forcing this devoted husband and father to leave those he loved so well ; and even when not separated, the constant moves, the frequent up-rooting from each home so soon as they had become attached to it, must have weighed heavily amongst the lesser ills of life. Moreover, even his profession, which he loved devotedly and in which he took so much pride, was not always a source of pure delight. He loved his country and the army enthusiastically, but he loved God and His Church far more ; and although as a soldier he could not question the political movements which the French army was employed to help or to hinder, yet, early in his military career, he had misgivings during the Italian campaign whether in fighting for France he was not fighting against the Holy See. Fortunately, the greater part of his active life was passed in Algeria, and here he could fight without any *arrière pensée*, and it was in the spirit of a true Crusader that he employed his talents both in subjugating and in governing the Arabs. These pages tell of his success in doing both. His skill and alertness were invaluable in the half guerilla warfare of the desert ; and his considerate and honourable treatment of the Arabs under all circumstances caused him to be greatly beloved and respected.

The only considerable war in which France was engaged during his

[No. 2 of Fourth Series.]

life, and in which De Sonis took no part was the Crimean. During those years he was usefully and actively busy in Algeria. In 1859, as we saw, he fought in the Italian campaign; and in 1870, though not attached to the Army on the Rhine in the early months of the Franco-German war, he was appointed to the command of a division in the Army of the Loire towards its close. Space forbids our dwelling in detail on the tragic history of those melancholy weeks. General de Sonis and Colonel de Charette were intimately associated in this campaign, and were united not only in their military duties, but were completely in sympathy in the religious spirit with which both fought. The disastrous fate of the French troops in the last months of 1870 are a matter of history; nor did De Sonis escape his full share of suffering and anguish. All but fatally wounded in an engagement near Loigny, on December 2nd, he lay the whole of a freezing cold night on the ground unaided and alone. Snow fell heavily; his leg broken in five-and-twenty places, would, in the course of nature, have caused him unspeakable pain; the cold and thirst were well-nigh unbearable; and yet, he seems to have been favoured with supernatural consolations which may be said to have extinguished his bodily pain. His confessors tell us: "During that fight the Blessed Virgin showed him extraordinary favours and filled him with ineffable consolations. His crushed limb, the freezing of the other parts, all the horrors of that fearful night, and his terrible sufferings, disappeared before that presence. "I only began to suffer again," he said, "when men tried to help me."

The results of this night were, however, irreparable. His leg was amputated on the following day, and gangrene having attacked the other foot, it was only at the expense of weeks of intense suffering that he did not lose this also. His recovery was slow and the latter years of his life were full of suffering; yet, to near the end, he still managed to mount his charger and head his troops. No wounds or pain could quench his military zeal; and he remained in the service until the Government, after many irreligious and un-Catholic demonstrations, at length gave the fatal commands for the repression of the religious orders, commands which were to be enforced, when necessary, by the sword. Rather than be the unwilling instrument of so great a sacrilege, General de Sonis retired from active service, and spent the remaining few years of his life at Passy, near Paris. His days were already numbered, and his death was a fitting sequel to his whole life. Indeed his end was so saint-like that many of his friends looked on a visit to him at this time in the light of a pilgrimage to some shrine; and here in August, 1887, he died the death of the just.

We feel that we have dwelt inadequately on the great spiritual beauty of the life before us—the constant devotion to God and His Church, the close union of the brave soldier with his Redeemer, but our space is limited, and we must beg our readers to study for themselves this living proof that all holiness is not confined to the cloister, and that in the French army of the nineteenth century a true saint and a devout hero may find his vocation. The book is dedicated, not unfitly, to General Lord Ralph Kerr, at whose instance it was translated into English.

Ireland and St. Patrick. By WILLIAM BULLEN MORRIS,
of the Oratory. London: Burns & Oates.

FATHER MORRIS has given us a delightful book. It appears opportunely, too, on the recurrence of the fourteen hundredth anniversary of the death of St. Patrick. Fourteen long centuries have rolled by since, in the words of the old chronicler the men of Erin mourned for Patrick, and turned night into day by the innumerable tapers at his funeral obsequies. The period is certainly long enough to estimate the value and durability of his work, and Father Morris's previous study in Patrician literature renders him well fitted for the task. He approaches it too as a Catholic writing for Catholics, and though outsiders may deem this an obstacle to the calm impartial treatment of the subject, yet the possession of the Catholic Faith is in reality an essential requisite for its adequate treatment. One who does not share in the faith of the Irish people can never write in that spirit of living sympathy with their religion which the nature of this work demands.

A non-Catholic writer might write in a spirit of the strictest historical fairness. He may display an unbounded veneration for the many excellent qualities of the Irish character. He may demonstrate from the treatment of Ireland in the past by her more powerful neighbour, that the faults of the Irish are solely the result of the barbarous legislation of that period. He may do all this in a manner to convince even the most sceptical, yet his work will lack that indescribable charm, which the pages of a Catholic writer, if he be equal to his task, are sure to contain. It seems a paradox to say that it requires a Catholic to portray the character of a saint, or to gauge the permanent worth of his labours. We are far from saying on the other hand that every book on subjects such as this written by a Catholic possesses this value,—there are many which do not. Father Morris's book does.

The materials for the history of Ireland, both ecclesiastical and civil, have been rapidly accumulating of late. The careful translations of the Rolls series have placed within reach of all a mass of priceless material. The higher historical criticism, too, and judicial fairness are beginning at last to be generally recognised in Ireland, and the country is ceasing to be disgraced by those so-called "Histories of Ireland," which even at best were nothing better than bulky party pamphlets. Ireland has not yet seen its Lingard. He will be the production of the future Irish Catholic University, and will appear at the proper time. Books like that of Father Morris will facilitate his task.

We have one serious quarrel with Father Morris. He has made St. Patrick a Frenchman. This is not the place to enter on a historical disquisition on the birth-place of our Saint. The question is needlessly complicated by some writers assigning various places on the most fanciful grounds as the region in which St. Patrick first saw the light. One writer from whom we might expect better things assign the south-west of England as the Saint's birth-place. The clear weight of intrinsic evidence in our opinion incontestably points to Strathclyde as being the Saint's native soil. The extrinsic evidence for this opinion is simple overwhelming. We are not forgetting, however, that the question is an open one—very much so—and that Father Morris has his right to his opinion as we have to ours, but we could not pass by what we think to be nothing better than downright flat historical heresy without girding away at it to the best of our power.

Passing over this one debatable question, on which agreement can not be had for a long time yet we fear, we hasten to say that with the rest of Father Morris's book we are in complete accord. The lengthy chapter on the Bull of Pope Adrian shows signs of great power and will well repay careful perusal. Father Morris strikes with no sword of lath, and he would be a bold man who could now maintain the authenticity of Adrian's Bull.

The three concluding essays are valuable for the historical information they convey as well as for the charm of their literary excellence. Occasionally they flash out into real eloquence, and it is these we think which will render the book popular in Ireland.

Anything relating to St. Patrick appeals to the Irish hearts. He lives enshrined for ever in the affections of the people. He is not so much a great saint and a great hero of the past, as a living, actual power of the present. He looms largely and clearly before the popular imagination. The character of the Irish for centuries has

been moulded on his teaching and example. There are few families in Ireland in which a child is not called Patrick. The popular form of salutation to this day in the Irish speaking portions of the country is "God and Mary and also Patrick be with you." Our own St. Augustine, whatever may have been the state of things before the reigns of Henry and Elizabeth, is certainly not in our days, (if we may reverently say so,) the same thing in the feelings of English Catholics that St. Patrick is in those of the Irish. Why it should be so we know not. Father Morris has given us some reasons for the Irish side of the question. We heartily recommend the book. The paper, type, and binding are all that could be desired.

Ballads and Lyrics. By KATHERINE TYNAN.

THE gifted authoress of this little book of poems, disarms criticism from the very outset, by the quaint and graceful "Apologia" with which she prefaces the work. We are not inclined to pass severe strictures on what is professedly simple and unpretentious. There is a good deal of poetry written nowadays, which although very pretentious, is vague, misty, and insipid to such a degree, that one may truly say that there is nothing in it. Poetry which has nothing in it should not be written, or, at all events, not inflicted on the public.

The volume of poetry before us is beautified by a vein of religious sentiment. It contains bright original conceptions and real poetical ideas, expressed with a certain amount of charm. Here and there we find too much rich imagery, too much gold and roses. There are pretty legends among the poems. But the mermaiden with a soul is a legend which draws too largely on our imagination. Some of the rhythm is very pleasing, as, for instance, "The Blackbird" (a new song with an old burden), but in other poems the perfection of the rhythm is not always equally maintained. The volume is elegantly got up and would be an appropriate gift-book.

Meditations on the Life of our Lord for every day in the year. By the late Rev. J. NOUET S.J. 2 vols. Dublin : Browne & Nolan.

THE writer of this review had in his possession some thirty years ago three volumes of this work, then published in four volumes but now reprinted in two, and applied but in vain for the fourth ; to his disappointment it was out of print. This is now no longer the

case, and he welcomes this sixth and new edition. Father Nouet excels as a compiler of *Meditations*; he does not exhaust the subject of meditation so as to leave nothing for the reader to do, but places before him sufficient matter upon which his intellect may dwell with profit. He points out the sentiments and affections which would flow from such reflexions, and without any pressure suggest practices to which such affections not unnaturally lead. Such a method is a great help to the many who find a difficulty in *Meditation*, and whose memory, mind and will are slow to act, while the few who have made sufficient progress in mental prayer to be able to exercise their faculties without any external guidance will find the fullest scope for them in the abundance of correct and solid matter to be found in each separate *Meditation*. These two volumes then appeal, and not without effect, to the intelligence, and are at the same time eminently devotional, affective and practical.

Bishop Wilberforce. By G. W. DANIELL, M.A. London : Methuen & Co. 1891.

THIS volume forms one of a new series of small books entitled "English Leaders of Religious Thought," which comprises short biographies of men differing from one another as widely as did Wesley, Maurice, and Chalmers from Cardinal Newman, a thoughtful sketch of whose character, from the pen of Mr. Hutton, preceded their lives in this issue.

It is difficult for a Catholic to form a correct estimate of the work before us, he, naturally, being entirely unable to view it from the standpoint from which it is written, and differing from the author not alone on first principles, but on the very ground from which he considers Bishop Wilberforce's life and sympathises with his work and efforts. A former and enthusiastic biographer, Dean Burgon, describes Samuel Wilberforce "as the remodeller of the episcopate," and it is Mr. Daniell's aim "to present his life, work, character, and influence mainly from the point of view thus suggested." But to us, to whom the Anglican episcopate is a mere name for the leading officials of a schismatical communion and a useful branch of the public service, the attempt to convert such officers into shepherds of the Christian flock and descendants of the Apostles appears to be a mere waste of time, energy, and zeal. No doubt we can welcome the elevation of their motives, and the higher view of their work with which an earnest mind can imbue those under his con-

trol and influence, and with which Dr. Wilberforce, for one, tried to stamp his clergy ; yet, in these pages we feel that our sympathy is asked for much that is marked with the inherent hollowness and unreality of Anglicanism, and that his efforts to infuse life and apostolity in the bench of English bishops, were as futile as his claims to Catholicity, for the Establishment of which we do not deny that he was an ornament.

The common accusation against the Church of England made both by ultra-Protestants and by the Catholic Church is this, that she does not know her own mind even on fundamental questions of the Faith; that she temporises where she ought to stand firm ; that she attempts to allow, and even succeeds in allowing, absolutely contradictory and hostile doctrines to be equally taught with her approval : and we are disposed to think that Dr. Wilberforce's success in itself forms a fatal testimony to the truth of this accusation. The highest praise that his biographer gives him is that he was so skilful in manipulating difficult questions, so conciliatory to those of completely different views, so full of tact in reconciling men to accede to much from which they conscientiously dissented, that the ever-threatened and dreaded disruption of parties within the Establishment was postponed. In fact, that it was he more than any other man who was the binding force which prevented the bundle of loose faggots from following their natural bent, and falling asunder.

From an Anglican point of view this may be praise ; but we doubt whether Christianity of the type represented by Samuel Wilberforce could have subdued the world as the Catholic Church has subdued it, or whether we can find any likeness to such a shepherd in the Apostolic College. We are told that both Protestants and so-called Anglo-Catholics exist, and were meant to exist within the Church of England, and that Dr. Wilberforce considered he was bound to do justice to both. If such indeed is the duty of an Anglican bishop, we may, perhaps, admire the skill with which he compromises between direct opposites, though we fear it must be at the expense of the sincerity and conscientiousness of the man himself. Indeed, we feel that the more the life before us is studied, the more we shall find that the highest praise we can bestow on Samuel Wilberforce is, that he was a remarkable specimen of a useful type—that of a successful chairman of public meetings. We have, of course, no wish to disparage his private piety; yet, as a public character, the popular estimate of him as a man above all anxious to smooth things over and to reconcile the irreconcileable, even at the expense of truth, is confirmed in this volume.

Added to the above estimate, we have to deplore in Dr. Wilberforce a bitter hatred of the Catholic Church, which loses no opportunity of exhibiting itself in violent language. Indeed, in his anxiety to appear in the popular character of an anti-papery ecclesiastic, he sometimes writes almost incoherently. What, for example, can be the meaning of this remark, which follows an opinion that the value for and the importance of prayer have risen in the Anglican communion: "With far less tendency to the corruptions of Rome, we have put forth more abundantly at home the blessed shoots of a loving charity?" (p. 110). However, it is Mr. Daniell's expressed opinion that the conversions to the faith in Dr. Wilberforce's family were detrimental to his own advancement in the Establishment. If he himself judged this to be the case, it may explain the hostility of his attitude towards the truth. An ambitious man thus thwarted would be likely to be embittered, and his language may thus be accounted for, although it cannot be excused or condoned.

Die Sentenzen Rolands. Nachmals Papstes Alexander III.
Zum ersten Mal herausgegeben von P. AMBROSIUS GIETL, O.P.
Freiburg : Herder. 1891.

F. DENIFLE, the learned sub-archivist of the Holy See, who enjoys a world-wide reputation through his History of the Universities during the Middle Ages, and is still more establishing his fame by the "Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis," the second volume of which has just made its appearance, was fortunate enough to detect in a codex of the public archives of Nürnberg the above manuscript. The edition is entirely the work of his able disciple, F. Gietl, O.P. of Graz, in Austria.

The *sententiae* of Roland Bandinelli, at first Professor of Theology in the University of Bologna, afterwards Cardinal and Chancellor of the Holy See, but best known as the great Pope Alexander III., belong to that class of mediaeval "Summae" out of which have grown the wonderful systems of St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure. In a pithy preface the editor enlarges on several questions relating to the *sententiae*. Above all he fully establishes the authorship of Rolandus, whose "Summa" of Canon law was established by Professor Thaner Insbruck, and then goes on to scrutinize the contents and the position which the work occupies in mediaeval theology. Let us point out that the "Sententiae Rolandi Bononiensis magistri" are made up of three parts, treating of Faith, the Sacraments

and Charity. Most remarkable is the treatise on the Sacraments, and chiefly that part which is occupied with canonical impediments. Rolandus firmly defends the opinion which traces the origin of matrimony in every case to the consent of the contracting parties. A mere superficial view taken of the *Sententiae* shows them to be incomplete, inasmuch as the concluding treatise on the last things is wanting. On the other hand it is to be remarked that some questions are exhaustively discussed, and seem to become in Rolandus' hands an antidote against current heresies. Special mention is deserved by the manner in which he teaches most exactly the real presence in the holy Eucharist. Students of mediæval theology will easily detect a kind of similitude between Rolandus and Abaelard. F. Gietl has spared no labour in bringing fresh light to bear upon this vexed question, and his critical notes will amply repay attentive perusal. The result is that although Rolandus is not seldom dependent on Abaelard, yet in questions of far-reaching importance he totally dissents from him. The admirable way in which F. Gietl has discharged his task enables us to form a very favourable idea of the scholastics in the middle ages, and the labour spent by them in elucidating the most weighty problems which still interest men's minds.

BELLESHEIM.

The Wisdom and Wit of Blessed Thomas More. Collected and edited by Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. London: Burns & Oates, 1892.

ENGLISH-speaking Catholics are once more laid under an obligation to Father Bridgett for a valuable work. The present is meant as a companion volume to his "Life of Blessed Thomas More" published last year, and as an instalment to hasten the reprint of Blessed More's complete works. But even when that publication appears, this collection of choice things will still be useful. There are many who laugh at the idea of presenting an author piecemeal, and of reading him in "rags and tags," of feeding upon dainty morsels; but these critics seem to assume that people who use such books never do any more continuous reading. They seem to forget too that in the present multiplication of books it is well-nigh impossible for most men to read all that they would desire. Where is the folly then in a man taking consideration of this want of time of his fellows, and reverently gathering and arranging choice extracts from the works of a voluminous author to show them his beauty, any more than in plucking a few flowers as specimens of the

wealth and colour of a garden? Besides, such a work as the present, in which the extracts are classed under the different headings of—"Ascetic; Dogmatic; Illustrative of the Period; Fancies, Sports, and Merry Tales; Colloquial and Quaint Phrases,"—supplies us with a handy book of reference to the opinions of a great man upon the "subjects of the day,"—his day as well as our own.

To the extracts Father Bridgett has prefixed an essay on the Wisdom and Wit of Blessed More; in which, after laying down that wisdom is a true and deep knowledge of the nature and purpose of human life, and a penetration of the truths of faith, he shows how this wisdom was reduced to practice by Blessed Thomas in his daily life. In the second part of this introductory chapter, the compiler lovingly describes "the strange yet beautiful mixture of joyousness and seriousness" in the life of the martyr; at the same time warning us that "we must not think of him for a moment as a jocose man, a jester, or a punster." His wit was not the result of frivolity, but was rather, and especially on the subject of religion, the outcome of his shrewd perception, which enabled him to see the hollowness and absurdity of error, and to unmask it to others. This, says Father Bridgett, is a temper which could be helpful nowadays to us, who are obliged to mix largely with unbelievers and misbelievers. He calls it arriving at the age of disdain, and thus describes it:—

The *age of disdain* is when we get a little knowledge of the world, the insight into human character, the sarcastic spirit of Blessed Thomas More.

Blessed Thomas excuses himself as follows for bringing in, among the most earnest matters, fancies, sports, and merry tales:—

One that is a layman, as I am, it may haply become him merrily to tell his mind, than seriously and solemnly to preach.

As a short specimen of his style we may instance the following short extract describing Serupulosity:—

Pusillanimity bringeth forth a very timorous daughter, a silly wretched girl, and ever puling, that is called Scrupulosity . . . This girl is a meetly good puzzle in a house, never idle, but ever occupied and busy; but albeit she have a gentle mistress that loveth her well, and is well content with what she doth . . . yet can this peevish girl never cease whining and puling for fear lest her mistress be always angry with her.

Books Received.

- Souvenirs du Maréchal Macdonald, Duc de Tarente.* By M. Camille Rousset, de l'Académie Française. Third Edition., pp. xxi-415. Librairie Plon, Paris. 7s. 6d.
- The State Last: A Study of Dr. Bouquillon's Pamphlet. Education: To Whom Does it Belong?* With Supplement. By Rev. James Conway, S.J. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York. pp. 116.
- Geschichte der Religion.* Vols. 1 and 2. By W. Wilmers, S.J. Druck & Berlag, Münster.
- Green Tea: A Love Story.* V. Schallenberger. London, T. Fisher Unwin. 1s. 6d.
- A Tug of War.* By Louisa Emily Dobrée. C.T.S. London: 18, West Square, S.E.
- The Trial of Margaret Brereton.* By Pleydell North. C.T.S. London: 18, West Square, E.C.
- Seeking a City.* By Maggie Symington. Cassell & Co. Limited, London. 1s. 6d.
- Rixae Oxonienses.* By Samuel F. Hulton. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell. 5s.
- The Holy Coat of Trèves.* A Sketch of its History, Cultus, and Solemn Expositions; with Notes on Relics generally. By Edward A. Plater. London: R. Washbourne.
- The Song of Dermot and the Earl.* An old French Poem from the Carew MS., No. 596, in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth Palace. Edited by Goddard Henry Orpen. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Frerville Chase.* Two vols. By E. H. Dering. Art and Book Co., Leamington and London.
- The Leading Ideas of the Gospel.* By William Alexander, D.D., D.C.L. London: Macmillan & Co.
- The Glories of Divine Grace.* A free rendering of the treatise of P. Eusebius Nieremberg, S.J. By Dr. M. Jos. Scheeben. Translated by a Benedictine Monk of S. Meinrad's Abbey. Ind. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- Seeds and Sheaves.* By Lady Lovatt. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.
- Grania.* The Story of an Island. Two vols. By the Hon. Emily Lawless. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.
- Short Sermons.* By the Rev. Stopford A. Brooke. London: Macmillan & Co. 6s.
- Christianity and Infallibility: Both or Neither.* By the Rev. Daniel Lyons. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 5s.
- Political Economy.* By Charles S. Devas. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 6s. 6d.

- The Browning Cyclopedia. A Guide to the Study of the Works of Robert Browning.* By Edward Berdoe. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.
- The Foundations of Faith, considered in Eight Sermons preached before the University of Oxford in 1879. Bampton Lectures.* By Henry Wace, D.D. London: John Murray.
- Secret Service under Pitt.* By W. J. Fitzpatrick, F.S.A. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 14s.
- Social Statics, Abridged and Revised; together with the Man versus the State.* By Herbert Spencer. Williams and Norgate, London.
- The Relations of the Church to Society. Theological Essays by Edmund J. O'Reilly, S.J. Edited, with a biographical notice, by Matthew Russell, S.J. John Hodges, London, 12s.*
- History of the Jews, from the earliest times to the present day.* By Professor H. Graetz. Edited by Bella Loüry. Vols. IV. and V. London: David Nutt.
- The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.* With Notes. By John Oldcastle. Burns & Oates, London.
- Memorials of Cardinal Manning.* Arranged and edited by John Oldcastle. Burns & Oates Ltd., London.
- Corps et Amé.* Essais sur la Philosophie de S. Thomas. Par M. J. Gardair. Paris: P. Lethielleux.
- Le Présent et l'Avenir du Catholicisme en France.* Par M. L'Abbé de Broglie. Paris: Librairie Plon.
- Visits to the Holy Sacraments of the Altar.* From the German by Rev. Augustine McClory, O.S.F. Mr. B. Herder, Freiburg. 1s. 3d.
- The Offices of Holy Week.* Art and Book Co., Leamington. 1s.
- Moments before the Tabernacle.* By Rev. Matthew Russell, S.J. Burns & Oates Ltd., London.
- Anima Divota.* From the Italian. Art and Book Co., Leamington. 2s.
- The Chorister's Vespers Book.* English and Latin. Art and Book Co., Leamington. 1s. 6d.
- My Zouave.* By Mrs Bartle Teeling. Burns & Oates Ltd., London.
- The Magi Kings.* By George Richardson. Art and Book Co., Leamington.
- Two Thousand Years of Gild Life.* By Rev. J. Malet Lambert, M.A. A. Brown & Sons, Hull. pp. 414.
- Organización de las Sociedades.* P. de Muñoz. pp. 378. Valladolid. Vuida de Cuesta é hijos.
- Los Espiritistas.* P. Muñoz.
- El Misticismo Ortodoxo.* M. Gutierrez. Valladolid Luis de Gaviria.
- Cuentos Morales para los niños.* P. Muñoz. pp. 571.
- Decimo Quinto Centenario de la Conversión de S. Augustin.* pp. 328.

